

3600. By Mr. DAVEY: Petition of 70 residents of Ravenna, Ohio, protesting against the proposed compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) or any other religious legislation which may be pending in Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3601. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of citizens of Allegan, protesting against Senate bill 3218, a bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3602. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Jewish Veterans of the Wars of the Republic, 15 Park Row, New York, N. Y., that the joint resolution be passed which has been introduced in Congress providing for admission for approximately 8,000 immigrants now stranded at European ports, these having passports duly viséed by the United States consuls prior to last July and being prevented from sailing because of exhaustion of quotas and new immigration law; this petition is presented in effort to undo grave injustice and to favor humanitarian measures; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3603. Also, petition of John H. McCandless, secretary courts committee, organized to promote the interest of the interior criminal courts, headquarters 69 Schermerhorn Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., care Brooklyn Bureau of Charities, that House bill 5195, by Congressman GRAHAM, be accorded favorable consideration by reason of the great good to be derived from the extending of the probation system to the Federal courts, which do not now have the power of placing offenders on probation. There has been ample opportunity to observe the workings of probation, especially for first offenders, and the courts committee of which Mr. McCandless is secretary are convinced that it is highly desirable that the Federal courts should have this same power. When consideration is given to the high type of Federal judges, we believe that we can count upon a wise choice of the cases to be placed on probation, and that the appointment of well-qualified probation officers to administer the system could be safely counted upon. The Brooklyn courts committee earnestly petitions support for this measure when it comes up for passage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3604. By Mr. McDUFFIE: Petition of 40 residents of Mobile, Ala., opposing the proposed Sunday observance law (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3605. By Mr. WELLER: Petition of the Rotary Club, of New York, urging that subtreasury building in New York City be converted into a national memorial and historic headquarters and to provide a permanent museum to contain specimens of all the coinage from the outset of this country; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

SENATE

FRIDAY, January 30, 1925

(Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1295)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The principal legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Ferris	Kendrick	Reed, Mo.
Bayard	Fess	Keyes	Reed, Pa.
Bingham	Fletcher	King	Sheppard
Borah	Frazier	McKellar	Shields
Brookhart	George	McKinley	Shipstead
Broussard	Gerry	McLean	Shortridge
Bruce	Glass	McNary	Simmons
Butler	Gooding	Mayfield	Smoot
Cameron	Greene	Means	Spencer
Capper	Hale	Metcalf	Stanley
Caraway	Harreld	Moses	Sterling
Copeland	Harris	Neely	Swanson
Couzens	Harrison	Norbeck	Trammell
Cummins	Heflin	Norris	Wadsworth
Curtis	Howell	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Warren
Dial	Johnson, Minn.	Pepper	Watson
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Philpotts	Wheeler
Fernald	Jones, Wash.	Halston	Willis

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Farrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1975) for the relief of the Commercial Union Assurance Co. (Ltd.), Federal Insurance Co., American and Foreign Marine Insurance Co., Queen Insurance Co. of America, Fireman's Fund Insur-

ance Co., United States Lloyds, and the St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co., and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the general organizer, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America (Federacion Libre), of Santurce, Porto Rico, relative to industrial conditions in Porto Rico and transmitting certain exhibits in regard to the wages of carpenters, joiners, and auxiliaries in the island of Porto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

Mr. FRAZIER presented the memorial of Henry Schrenk and 32 other citizens of Logan and McIntosh Counties, in the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Home Economic Club, of Ryder, N. Dak., favoring the adoption of the child labor amendment to the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, favoring the permanent improvement of the Missouri River to Kansas City, Mo., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Galena, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. FERNALD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment:

H. R. 7821. An act to convey to the city of Astoria, Oreg., a certain strip of land in said city;

H. R. 7911. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the appraisers' stores property in Providence, R. I.; and

H. R. 11501. An act for the exchange of land in El Dorado, Ark.

Mr. COPELAND, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3676. An act for the relief of Harry Newton (Rept. No. 939); and

H. R. 1717. An act authorizing the payment of an amount equal to six months' pay to Joseph J. Martin (Rept. No. 940).

Mr. BAYARD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9535) authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels belonging to the United States, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 941) thereon.

Mr. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8329) for the relief of Albert S. Matlock, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 942) thereon.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 5752. An act for the relief of George A. Petrie (Rept. No. 943);

H. R. 8727. An act for the relief of Roger Sherman Hoar (Rept. No. 944); and

H. R. 8741. An act for the relief of Flora M. Herrick (Rept. No. 945).

Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6436) for the relief of Isidor Steger, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 946) thereon.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 164) to provide payment for additional work on the Grant Memorial, Washington, D. C., moved that that committee be discharged from its further consideration and that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Claims, which was agreed to.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 917) for the relief of Ernest F. Church, formerly boatswain, United States Naval Reserve,

moved that that committee be discharged from its further consideration and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Claims, which was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mr. WATSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that January 30, 1925, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 51. An act for the relief of the owner of the schooner *Itasca*;

S. 703. An act making an adjustment of certain accounts between the United States and the District of Columbia;

S. 1179. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close certain streets, roads, or highways in the District of Columbia rendered useless or unnecessary by reason of the opening, extension, widening, or straightening, in accordance with the highway plan of other streets, roads, or highways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1199. An act authorizing the appointment of William Schuyler Woodruff as an Infantry officer, United States Army;

S. 1665. An act to provide for the payment of one-half the cost of the construction of a bridge across the San Juan River, N. Mex.;

S. 2148. An act to empower certain officers, agents, or employees of the Department of Agriculture to administer and take oaths, affirmations, and affidavits in certain cases, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to take action relative to adjustments in the rate structure of common carriers subject to the interstate commerce act, and the fixing of rates and charges.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 4134) to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers and real-estate salesmen; to create a real-estate commission; and to provide a penalty for a violation of the provisions hereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 4135) granting an increase of pension to Leotia L. Coombs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 4136) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building thereon at Fort Lauderdale, Fla.;

A bill (S. 4137) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building thereon at Plant City, Fla.;

A bill (S. 4138) for the purchase of a site and erection of a post-office building thereon at Winter Haven, Fla.;

A bill (S. 4139) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building thereon at Bradenton, Fla.;

A bill (S. 4140) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building thereon at Arcadia, Fla.;

A bill (S. 4141) to enlarge, extend, and remodel the public building at Tampa, Fla.;

A bill (S. 4142) to enlarge, extend, remodel, etc., public building at Lakeland, Fla.;

A bill (S. 4143) for the erection of a public building for a post office and other purposes at Lake City, Fla.; and

A bill (S. 4144) for the erection of a public building for a post office and other purposes at Key West, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 4145) for the relief of J. C. Peixotto; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4146) granting a pension to Mary L. Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 4147) granting an increase of pension to George F. Hathaway (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4148) to provide a complete code of insurance law for the District of Columbia (excepting marine insurance as now provided for by the act of March 4, 1922, and fraternal and benevolent insurance associations or orders as provided for by the act of March 3, 1901), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 4149) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Vaughan (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4150) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Van Buskirk (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 4151) to provide for aided and directed settlement on Government land in irrigation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4152) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a perpetual easement for railroad right of way over and upon a portion of the military reservation on Anastasia Island, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4153) creating a Federal cooperative marketing board to encourage and aid, upon application, in the formation of cooperative marketing associations, cooperative clearing-house associations, and terminal market associations handling agricultural products; to correlate the activities of such associations; to develop efficient and economical methods of distributing and marketing such products; to bring to the aid of such associations the resources of the departments of the Federal Government; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. COUZENS:

A bill (S. 4154) to provide for the reincorporation of the National Daughters of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 4155) to provide cooperation to safeguard endangered agricultural and municipal interests and to protect the forest cover on the Santa Barbara, Angeles, San Bernardino, and Cleveland National Forests from destruction by fire, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 4156) to authorize the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in California and the surrounding States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. PEPPER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 178) to provide for the loaning to the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts of the portraits of Daniel Webster and Henry Clay; to the Committee on the Library.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI WILD LIFE AND FISH REFUGE

Mr. REED of Missouri. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask may be read at length and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 179) to amend section 10 of the act entitled "An act to establish the upper Mississippi River wild-life and fish refuge" was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 10 of the act entitled "An act to establish the upper Mississippi River wild life and fish refuge," approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. L. p. 650), be, and the same hereby is, amended by striking out that part of said section which reads: "but no money shall be available for the acquisition of any area until the Secretary of Agriculture has ascertained that all of the areas to be acquired under this act will be acquired within the amounts appropriated or authorized to be appropriated therefor and at an average price not in excess of \$5 per acre, and not in excess of the average selling price, during the years 1921, 1922, and 1923, of comparable lands within the vicinity of such areas," and by substituting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall not pay for any land or land and water a price which, when added to the price of land or land and water theretofore purchased, shall exceed an average cost of \$5 per acre."

JEREMIAH JOSEPH MURPHY

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 4157) authorizing the appointment of Jeremiah Joseph Murphy a captain in the Infantry of the United States Army, which was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Jeremiah Joseph Murphy, now a warrant officer of the Regular Army of the United States, to the position and rank of captain of Infantry in said Army, to rank from July 1, 1920.

The accompanying statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE MILITARY RECORD OF JEREMIAH JOSEPH MURPHY

Born in Ireland June 6, 1885.

EDUCATION

Equivalent of high school and two years at college.

MILITARY EXPERIENCE

May 21, 1911, to April 18, 1917, in the First Battalion of Engineers and the First Engineers, as private, corporal, sergeant, and first sergeant.

April 19, 1917, to October 25, 1919, in the Sixth Engineers, as first sergeant, master engineer, second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and captain.

October 27, 1919, to August, 1921, First Engineers, as master engineer.

August, 1921, to date, warrant officer, United States Army.

Now holds a commission as captain in the Engineer Officers' Reserve Corps.

In France and Germany from December, 1917, to August, 1919.

During the World War he participated with his regiment in the following engagements: Somme defensive, Marne defensive and offensive, St. Mihiel, and the Argonne.

In Greece on relief work with the American Red Cross from January, 1923, to July, 1923.

August, 1923, to February, 1924, on duty in Governors Island, N. Y., in the Adjutant General's Department.

February, 1924, to date, in the United States district engineer's office, Pittsburgh, Pa.

PREFERENCE IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 11791) to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Mr. McNARY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 320), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a complete investigation with respect to proposed legislation relating to the protection and development of the Colorado River Basin. For the purposes of this resolution such committee or subcommittee is authorized to hold hearings prior to the beginning of the first regular session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, and to employ such clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The committee or subcommittee is further authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to take testimony; and the expense attendant upon the work of the committee or subcommittee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE DISTRICT COMMITTEE

Mr. CAPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 321), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Resolved, That there be, and hereby is, appointed a special assistant to the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia who shall be a stenographer and who shall be paid a salary not to exceed \$2,000 per annum, in regular monthly installments, from and after the date of the passage of this resolution.

INVESTIGATION OF FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY AT MADISON, WIS.

Mr. BROOKHART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 322), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas Arthur Arent, president of the Arthur Arent Laboratories (Inc.), of Des Moines, Iowa, has submitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate a sworn statement in which he alleges that unfair methods have been used and untrue statements have been made by officials in the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Department of Agriculture at Madison, Wis., and that these officials are acting in conjunction with certain creosote interests to destroy the sale of his products; and

Whereas Arthur Arent has requested the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to examine the evidence submitted by him and to afford him a hearing concerning the methods, statements, and practices of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., and of such creosote interests: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete investigation into the accuracy of such charges and allegations, to ascertain the facts concerning such practices, statements, and methods, and to report thereon to the Senate.

POSTAL SALARIES AND POSTAL RATES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3674) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment in section 208, the first paragraph of subsection (b), was agreed to may be reconsidered that I may offer an amendment to it.

Mr. MOSES. Inasmuch as the Senator can offer his amendment when the bill is in the Senate, will he not wait until then?

Mr. HARRISON. I prefer to offer it in this way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. MOSES. I shall not object. Of course, the Senator can offer the amendment when the bill gets into the Senate and in any event he is merely anticipating.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection and the vote by which the part of the amendment indicated was agreed to will be reconsidered.

Mr. HARRISON. Now, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi offers an amendment to the first paragraph, which the clerk will report.

The READING CLERK. Strike out the first paragraph of subsection (b) of section 208 as amended, reading as follows:

(b) That on fourth-class matter the rate of postage shall be by the pound as established by, and in conformity with, the act of August 24, 1912, and in addition thereto there shall be a service charge of 2 cents for each parcel, except upon parcels or packages collected on rural delivery routes, to be prepaid by postage stamps affixed thereto, or as otherwise prescribed by the regulations of the Postmaster General.

And insert in lieu thereof:

(b) That on fourth-class matter the rate of postage shall be by the pound, the postage in all cases to be prepaid by postage stamps affixed thereto or as otherwise prescribed by regulations of the Postmaster General.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered, if it should be adopted, would leave the postal rate on parcel-post matter the same as it is at the present time. In other words, it would eliminate the 2-cent flat postage rate that has been adopted upon all parcels and would eliminate the exception that was incorporated in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. The question is whether we propose to take care of the estimated deficit to the extent of \$20,000,000 from the parcel-post mail or whether we will leave the old rate intact.

From the report of the Post Office Department we find that on first-class mail matter the revenues were \$271,000,000 and the expenditures \$191,000,000, leaving quite a balance in favor of the Government. On second-class matter the revenues were \$31,000,000 and the expenditures \$105,000,000, a loss to the Government of \$74,000,000. We all know and the country knows that that deficit is caused by the advertising matter in the newspapers and periodicals carried through the mails. There is \$74,000,000 lost to the Government every year from that source. My amendment does not propose to disturb what has been done by the Senate respecting that matter. But when we come to the fourth class we find that the revenue to the Government was \$120,000,000 and the expenditures were \$127,000,000, leaving a net loss of only \$6,916,000. So we find that while on parcel post the Government has lost approximately \$7,000,000 and on second-class matter—namely, newspapers and periodicals—has lost \$74,000,000, yet when we come to raise the revenue on this measure we find that through the amendments that have been adopted by the action of the Senate we have incurred a still greater deficit of \$600,000 to \$900,000 on the newspapers and periodicals, while we attempt to raise \$20,000,000 additional revenue from the parcel post.

Why should we place a further burden on the farmers of the country by increasing the rates on parcel-post packages in order to raise 40 per cent of the deficit which would be incurred in paying the increased salaries to the postal employees? That is what is proposed to be done. The committee bill does not attempt to equalize the rates in order that the various classes of mail matter shall share their proportion, but it places the burden on the parcel post service to the amount of 40 per cent.

Mr. President, there is no justification for making the farmers of the country pay \$20,000,000 and reducing the amount to be paid by the newspapers and periodicals of the country to the extent of \$640,000 below what they now pay. Although

such publications alone are carried at a deficit of \$74,000,000, as is shown by the report of the Post Office Department, and there is created by the parcel post service a deficit of only \$7,000,000, yet it is now proposed to raise from the parcel post \$20,000,000, and, I repeat, to give to the newspapers and the periodicals a decrease in their rates from \$600,000 to \$900,000. So I submit that we should not increase the parcel-post rates. If the amendment which I have offered shall be adopted, it will leave the parcel-post rates just as they are to-day.

Now let us consider the 2-cent flat rate which is placed upon the parcel post service. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] on yesterday stated that there would be derived from that item \$20,000,000. It is shown, I believe, by the hearings, as I have read them, that about 1,000,000,000 parcels are shipped through the mails every year. A 2-cent rate will amount to \$20,000,000. Mr. Stewart, in his testimony before the committee, stated that about 1½ per cent of the total amount of parcels shipped by parcel post originate on rural routes. Consequently, the exception which is made by the so-called George amendment which has been adopted that the 2-cent flat rate shall not apply upon parcels which originate in rural routes would take care of 1½ per cent of all the parcels that enter into the parcel post—an almost infinitesimally small number—and yet there would be gentlemen who would go back to the farmers and say we released them from this increase of 2 cents. Senators, you will not be able to deceive them through any such course.

The hearings disclosed the further fact that Mr. Stewart, who, perhaps, knows more than anyone else in the whole department about the operation of postal matters, stated that about 35 per cent of all the parcels that go into the parcel post service are delivered through the third and fourth class post offices.

We all know that the third and fourth class post offices supply the farmer, supply the man in the little village, and that a great proportion of the 35 per cent of the 1,000,000,000 packages that go into that service concern the farmers of the country.

Mr. Stewart further testified that the farmers on the rural routes receive about 10½ per cent of the parcels that enter into the parcel post. If that be true, such parcels are not excepted under the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, but the 2-cent increase which is proposed in the bill is imposed upon them. So, Mr. President, we have here the remarkable situation that it is proposed to raise from the farmers of the country 40 per cent of the \$50,000,000 which is expected to be raised in the bill. It is unjust; it is unfair; it is indefensible from any angle.

Not only is it proposed to put the 2 cents charge upon all packages that enter into the parcel post, which would cost the farmers approximately \$20,000,000, but it is proposed to go beyond that, so that when the farmer buys merchandise or something else in the little village or the town or the far-away city and has to buy a money order at the third or fourth class post office, he will have to pay an increase from the present rate of 3 cents to 5 cents on the smaller amounts. It is not a big item, but it is an item of expense, and the farmer will have to pay that additional burden.

However, the framers of this bill do not stop there. It seems as though they picked out the farmer as the one from whom the additional revenue should be raised and paid no attention to anyone else. Indeed, in writing the provisions of the bill, in the beginning it was proposed to compel the newspapers and periodicals to pay a part of this sum, but when the proprietors of those publications, with all their power and influence, sent word to the committee to cease their efforts in that direction, they got off, and they got off very quickly. Instead of leaving those provisions of the bill as they were, we find that through reductions brought about by the various amendments the publishers now receive a greater benefit than they formerly did. I have no quarrel about that matter; my amendment does not affect that situation at all; but I say it is unjust, when, as a result of the rates which are imposed on second-class matter, there is a deficit of \$74,000,000, and on the fourth-class matter, covering the parcel-post service, there is a deficit of only \$7,000,000, to attempt in this bill to raise \$20,000,000 from the Parcel Post System and make the deficit for carrying newspapers and periodicals greater than it is to-day.

If Senators can defend that, well and good.

But those sponsoring this bill did not stop at putting the 2-cent additional rate upon packages which enter the Parcel Post System; they did not stop at the increase of the rate upon the little money orders which the farmers have to purchase from the post office in order to buy at a distance goods or merchandise; but it is proposed to increase the rate upon the insurance that is taken out at the post office in order to mail packages of goods to the farmer living away out in the woods.

So when the farmer on a rural route desires to buy something in Chicago or in New York or in Baltimore or in Washington he is burdened by the increased rates on money orders, and then he must pay the increased rates for insurance which are imposed on the goods shipped to him.

So, Senators, I submit this amendment in utter good faith. I say it is not fair to burden the farmers to this extent. Let us leave the matter, so far as they are concerned, as it is in the present law. Let us not cripple the parcel-post service of this country. There was a long and a tedious fight before we could write into the law provisions establishing the Parcel Post System. It is working well; it is bringing benefits to those living on the rural routes and at the small post offices of the country. It is carrying some relief to the consumers of America through the elimination of the middleman. Let us do nothing by our action here that will destroy or injure the system. We ought not to cripple that service; and if my amendment shall be adopted, as I hope it will be, we will leave the present law intact and will at least restrain ourselves in this instance from imposing greater burdens on the farmers of the country.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Is it not the opinion of Senators that the money-order facilities are used to a greater extent by the farmers and poorer people of the country who do not carry banking accounts than by others?

Mr. HARRISON. There is no question about that.

Mr. TRAMMELL. And, therefore, in increasing the charges on that service the burden is shifted to the farmers and poorer classes of people throughout the country?

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator, of course, is right in that contention.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi had been present during the past few days in order to be enlightened by the debate on this question, instead of being absent elsewhere enlightening other people on their political duties, he would have learned the reason why these amendments were proposed by the committee. I can not refrain, however, Mr. President, from congratulating the Senator from Mississippi upon the ardent return to his former manner of oratory, although the speech which he has just made is one which I would have expected him to make prior to his reelection instead of afterwards.

Mr. President, the parcel post comprises more than 64 per cent of the weight of the mails and more than 50 per cent of the bulk of the mails. I instance these facts because the Post Office Department sells postage by weight and transports mail matter by the cubic foot. The parcel post, comprising more than 60 per cent of the weight of the mail and more than 50 per cent of the bulk of the mail, pays less than 25 per cent of the mail revenue. The parcel post alone among all classes of mail matter has enjoyed an absolute reduction in its money rates during the period when the rates on all other classes of mail matter have been increased. It has received a further favor in that the weight of the package to be carried has been multiplied and the cubic contents of the package to be carried have been multiplied.

Under these circumstances the subcommittee rejected utterly the figures of the cost-ascertainment committee so far as they relate to the parcel post. The committee viewed with skepticism, to say the least, another conclusion of the cost-ascertainment committee, and even considering the burden which the Senator describes so pathetically as being about to be imposed on the 1½ per cent of the parcel-post business originating on rural routes and on only 10½ per cent, taking the item of packages delivered on rural routes into the calculation, as compared with the entire parcel-post business of the department, came unanimously to the conclusion that the service charge should be added; and for another reason, too, than for the revenue which would be derived. The increase in parcel-post revenue will give us a more accurate understanding of the volume of the parcel post, because it is very easy to divide the added revenue by 2 cents and ascertain the number of packages.

I do not question the Senator's good faith in presenting this amendment. The Senator's good faith, Mr. President, would proceed to the point where he would destroy this bill in its practical effect; and if the Senator's amendment taking \$18,000,000 out of the sum proposed to be raised by these rates shall be adopted it will destroy the bill. The question of voting on the Senator's amendment comes, therefore, in the last analysis, Mr. President, to the question which has constantly

confronted us as we have been voting on the amendments offered by the committee and those offered from the floor, namely, whether we really want to carry out the purpose which Congress so overwhelmingly expressed last June.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays are demanded. Is there a second?

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The demand for the yeas and nays does not seem to be sufficiently seconded.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I thought the Chair was about to recognize another Senator. I think there were a sufficient number to second the demand. I make the point of no quorum, if there is not a sufficient number to second the demand now present.

Mr. NORRIS. I hope the Senator will not do that.

Mr. MOSES. If the Senator wishes to delay the passage of the bill, he can do so.

Mr. HARRISON. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to say a few words, and there are other Senators who wish to speak to the amendment. Otherwise I should be willing to have the vote now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi make the point of no quorum?

Mr. HARRISON. I withdraw that suggestion, but I do not want to be deprived of the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The demand for the yeas and nays now appears to be sufficiently seconded, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have in my hand an estimate of the additional revenue which will be derived from this bill. I find that the estimate as given here is \$29,142,000; and, of course, with the amendments which have been accepted by the Senate the amount of revenue will be materially less than this.

I have the feeling, Mr. President, that the measure before us is a sham bill. I doubt if the country will be satisfied either by the passage of the bill or by the defeat of postal legislation which, to my mind, is imminent.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the statement just made by the Senator is very interesting. I understood him to say that he held in his hand a statement showing that the amount of revenue estimated to be derived from this bill is \$29,000,000. That is so in conflict with the statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] as to what it would yield that I should like to ask the Senator who made that estimate.

Mr. COPELAND. It was exactly because I had the feeling that is apparently in the mind of the Senator from North Carolina that I spoke of this matter. I have here an analysis of the Sterling bill, which was handed me by one of the Senators new on the floor, sent to him, as I understand, by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], with this particular memorandum attached, which I hand to the Senator, showing an estimated increase of revenue of \$29,000,000.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question on that point?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. Was that estimate of \$29,000,000 made after the adoption of the committee amendments, or before?

Mr. COPELAND. Before, as I understand.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, it is conceded that the adoption of the committee amendments reduces the amount very materially below that.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, no; oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New York made a misstatement with regard to that. He referred to the Sterling bill as the bill analyzed and of which he has the analysis there; but that is not the Sterling bill. The estimate on the Sterling bill, I think, was about \$66,000,000 instead of \$29,000,000.

Mr. MOSES. That is correct, Mr. President. The estimate of \$29,000,000 was made by the Post Office Department upon the erroneous print of the bill, which I explained to the Senate yesterday, the Senator from New York being then absent. He probably has not taken time to read the Record this morning. The estimate of \$29,000,000 arose from the erroneous print of the bill which was in the hands of Senators. The errors were pointed out in the course of the discussion yesterday, and were corrected in the amendments which were offered either by me or by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]; so that the sum total to be raised in this bill is substantially what I stated to the

Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] in the short colloquy which he and I had toward the close of the day.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, in spite of this I wish to say I regard this bill as a bill intended to save the face of the President because of his veto, and I doubt exceedingly if it will be enacted into law. I have no doubt that when it is all over the postal employees will still be cheated out of the increases to which they are clearly entitled.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MOSES. Does the Senator intend to vote for this bill when it comes up for passage?

Mr. COPELAND. I am very glad, Mr. President, to answer that question. I want to say before doing so that it would be impossible to plan another bill so violative of senatorial freedom in voting. I doubt if a dozen Members of this body are satisfied with the measure. A large majority favors increased pay for the postal employees. I venture to say that a majority opposes the increased rate on newspapers. There can be no doubt that the parcel-post increases would be defeated by an overwhelming vote if that particular item of the bill could be considered separate and apart from the other features. The measure is unfair to the Senate; it is unfair to the newspaper owners; it is unfair to the farmers and the small merchants of this country; it is unfair to the postal employees, because for what is their just desert it is proposed to barter a distasteful and unnecessary revenue bill.

The newspapers which most loudly advocated the election of "Coolidge to avoid chaos" will be hardest hit. In spite of the fact that they deserve the medicine they must take, I am regretful of their plight. We need the educational work so ably done by the press of the country.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. STERLING. Will the Senator point out wherein there has been any increase in rates on newspapers in the bill so far?

Mr. COPELAND. Is there any doubt in the mind of the Senator that there is an increase?

Mr. STERLING. I think there is some doubt. The flat rate goes back to 1¼ cents per pound.

Mr. COPELAND. And yet, Mr. President, Senators on the other side of the aisle contend that there is going to be an increase of \$50,000,000. I think that was the amount mentioned by the Senator from New Hampshire. Where is it to come from?

Mr. STERLING. According to the present estimate of the Senator from New Hampshire, \$50,000,000 will be produced by this bill after the adoption of the amendments which were adopted.

Mr. COPELAND. I hope, if it becomes necessary to pass this revenue bill, that there may be, from some proper source, the increased income which the Senator suggests.

Mr. STERLING. I will say to the Senator from New York that neither in the flat rate on the reading matter of newspapers nor in the rate on the advertising portions of newspapers is there an increase of rates over the bill as first presented or over the rates as they now exist under the law.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from South Dakota, I think, will have some difficulty in satisfying the newspapers of this country as to the accuracy of that particular statement, certainly as it relates to the ultimate effect of the bill upon the postal rates they will pay in the future.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ODDIE. I refer the Senator from New York to the proceedings of the Senate on yesterday in regard to this matter.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if we listened to the Senators on the other side of the aisle we would conclude pretty soon that nobody is hurt by the bill; that there is no increase from any source. It strikes me there is a very marked inconsistency between the statement of the chairman of the committee that there is going to be an increase of \$50,000,000 in revenue and these repeated statements from Senators on the other side that nobody is going to be hurt because there is to be no increase in the rate of postage charged on any class of mail service.

After a while, I think, particularly after they hear about the effect on the parcel post, the farmers of America will find out that they never get any consideration from the Republican Party. All that the leaders of the "Grand Old

Party" care about the farmers is their votes. This blow at the Parcel Post System may break the back of the patient agriculturist.

I am glad that we were able to save the religious and fraternal organizations from the wreck. They alone stand unscathed in the general smash.

In the face of the Treasury returns, showing a vast surplus, this revenue bill is unnecessary. It is an outrage upon legislative decency. I am ashamed of it, and stand amazed at the effrontery of the party presenting it.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] asked if I should vote for the bill. I am forced to vote for it because of the kernels of goodness it contains. Whatever virtues it possesses were made possible by Democratic votes. Whatever evils it has—and they are legion—are the gift to the country of the administration and the Republican Party in an effort to save the President's face because of his veto.

A famous Republican Governor of Michigan once said that he "held his nose and voted the Republican ticket." I shall hold my nose and vote for this bill, because in no other way than by its passage can the faithful employees of the Government be rewarded. The corrupt practices amendment, put upon the bill by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], is essential to the purity of our elections. I trust it may result in breaking the strangle hold opulent Republicans have on the electorate in certain sections.

It is a shame to think that senatorial freedom in voting is destroyed by the present methods of controlling legislation. In Senate hall and committee rooms our legislative acts should be determined. I shall be glad, Mr. President, when the *Mayflower* is used exclusively for the pleasure and executive duties of the President. When it is so employed, fewer public officials will use nautical language and respond: "Aye, aye, sir!" to the commands of the White House.

I speak strongly because I feel strongly. This bill is outrageous, and I feel outraged that I must vote for it, as I shall.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York answer a question that I should like to propound to him?

Mr. COPELAND. I shall be glad to answer the question.

Mr. ODDIE. In view of what took place in the Senate yesterday, does not the Senator think it would be better to correct the statement he has just made regarding the rates on newspapers?

Mr. COPELAND. Does the amendment which was adopted yesterday, as the Senator from Nevada understands it, return all newspaper rates to the old rates in all the zones?

Mr. ODDIE. No, Mr. President; there are several changes. The rates as they are now in the bill which is before us are not exactly as they were before.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator mean by that that there are some raises in the newspaper rates?

Mr. ODDIE. No; I do not mean by that, Mr. President, that there are any raises, because there are no raises. The rates are slightly below the existing rates.

Mr. COPELAND. Oh! Then, so far as the newspapers are concerned, the rate is to be less, is it, than the present rate?

Mr. ODDIE. Yes; but that is not the point I have raised. I have not raised the point of the advisability or the inadvisability, as some may say, of the change in rates; but I have raised the point that the Senator from New York has made a statement which can not be borne out by the facts—that the rates adopted yesterday by the Senate were above the existing rates, when as a matter of fact they are below.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, for information I should like to ask the Senator a question. I may have made a mistake. As I understand, the rates were lowered on reading matter in newspapers. They were left exactly the same in the first and second zones on advertising matter under the amendment of the Senator from Nevada, were they not?

Mr. ODDIE. They were, but below the existing rates on reading matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other zones they were increased. Unless that is true, I misunderstand the situation. They were lowered on reading matter to $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents and on advertising matter they were left the same in the first and second zones and in the farther zones they were increased. Is that the Senator's understanding of the situation?

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, if the Senators will permit me, the average rate for all zones now is $5\frac{1}{2}$ cents. The rate proposed in the bill as originally introduced, under the rates formulated by the Post Office Department, was 6.625 cents. The average rate for all zones as now standing is 5.625 cents, or 1 cent less than that proposed by the Post Office Department and

three-fourths of a cent above existing rates. That is the average for all zones.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was my understanding of it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from New York would have the Senator from New Hampshire elucidate this matter just a little further. I think it is very misleading to say that the average in all zones is raised just a little on advertising matter. It is decreased in the first zone, the second zone, and perhaps the third zone, is it not?

Mr. MOSES. No.

Mr. NORRIS. Just in the first two zones?

Mr. MOSES. It remains exactly the same in the first and second zones.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it is fair to state, and I will be corrected by the Senator from New Hampshire if it is wrong, that the average rate is increased by reason of an increase in the far zones. Newspapers do not circulate in those zones.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. COPELAND. Just one moment. I want to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if, according to his estimates of this morning, there will be any increase in revenue because of the change in law relating to the postal rates on newspapers?

Mr. MOSES. I do.

Mr. COPELAND. How much does he estimate it will be?

Mr. MOSES. I think it will be between three and four million dollars.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well, then. Mr. President, how can any Senator on the other side of the aisle say that there is to be the same rate upon newspapers, when the Senator from New Hampshire states that there is to be an increase of three or four millions in the revenue from postage upon newspapers? It is absurd, and in this matter, as in all others relating to this particular bill, the Senators on the other side are throwing dust in the air.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. "A little learning is a dangerous thing," Mr. President. The Senator from New York, if he understood the postal-rate structure at all, would know that in second-class postal rates there are two classifications; and I am not now speaking of newspapers and periodicals. I am speaking of the second-class matter deposited in the mails by the publishers. There is, in addition, Mr. President, a very large volume of second-class mail carried by the Postal Service which is known as the transient second class—individual periodicals and newspapers deposited in the mails by persons who, having read a magazine, for example, want to send it to a friend. Those rates carry \$1,000,000.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GOODING. I would like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire, who has had this bill in charge, how much of a decrease the Oddie amendment makes in the revenue derived from second-class matter in the first zone beyond that produced by the amendment of the subcommittee which has been adopted?

Mr. MOSES. It is absolutely impossible to answer that question.

Mr. GOODING. How much, approximately?

Mr. MOSES. I would think that the effect of the Oddie amendment, as compared first with the proposals of the subcommittee, might be to reduce the total increase in revenue on that class of periodicals by something like \$1,000,000.

Mr. GOODING. How much less would it be than the revenue now collected by the Government on that class?

Mr. MOSES. I should think about a million and a half.

Mr. GOODING. Less than what is now collected?

Mr. MOSES. Yes. But, of course, Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho must understand that when you undertake to separate second-class matter into any one of the eight zones you are coming to a point where it is a mere rule of thumb for estimating, and I am giving the Senator from Idaho the best judgment I possess about it.

Mr. GOODING. I am sure the Senator is; but it is an actual reduction from the present rate now being paid?

Mr. MOSES. I so regard it.

Mr. COPELAND. I suppose, Mr. President, that it is impossible to tell, because the bill, to use a word which I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will not consider a wrong word to use in view of his statement the other day, is so unscientific that he has to use "a rule of thumb" to determine what will happen.

Mr. MOSES. I want to assure the Senator from New York now that I have become quite accustomed to the eccentricities of his vocabulary, and no word he can use will irritate me.

Mr. COPELAND. I am very happy that the Senator from New Hampshire is so yielding and kind. I find him so in personal contacts as well as on the floor of the Senate. But I want to discuss further with the Senator from New Hampshire the revenues to be derived under this bill. We have now discovered that the Oddie amendment saves a million, but that still the newspapers will have to pay \$3,000,000 more than they are paying at present. Will the Senator from New Hampshire assure us now that on the parcel post there will be no additional burden upon the people?

Mr. MOSES. Oh, Mr. President, I suppose a hundred times in the course of the discussion on this bill I have undertaken to say, and I probably have been unintelligent in saying it, since I have not conveyed the idea to the Senator from New York, that we have undertaken in this bill to allocate, so far as possible, the amount of money we seek to derive to all the classes of mail matter, and necessarily the parcel post will have to take a portion of it.

Mr. COPELAND. How much?

Mr. MOSES. The Senator might have read that in the RECORD this morning, inasmuch as he was not here yesterday, but I estimate that it will be something like \$20,000,000. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] stated it this morning, and he was accurate about it. I did not deny his figures. The Senator from New York heard that. He could have grasped it then.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire need not worry about whether the Senator from New York knows it or not. I want the Senator from New Hampshire to repeat this frequently, so that the country may know that \$20,000,000 is going to be put upon them to pay for the advances proposed in this bill for the parcel post, \$20,000,000 upon the farmers and the small merchants of this country.

Mr. MOSES. If the Senator from New York will be patient, as I am, and will wait until after he has held his nose and voted for the bill, I purpose to state on the floor of the Senate, and to put into the RECORD, of course, my opinion of what the bill will produce and from what classes of mail matter. I have no intention of keeping from the Senate or from the country any facts essential with reference to the rates which we propose. I intend that the country shall know, and from me, what the effect of this bill will be upon all classes of mail matter.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I realize the discomfiture of the Senator from New Hampshire. He is just as anxious to have these postal salaries increased as I am. He has shown his bravery by presenting to the Senate and to the country an outrageous bill, which was entirely unnecessary in view of the state of the Treasury. In order that others in high place may not suffer criticism for the defeat of the postal employees' salaries, the Senator from New Hampshire, in his kindness of heart, fathers a bill proposing a "slight increase," as he says, "which does not amount to very much," only "a few millions," in order that we may be spared the pain of another presidential veto. I congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire!

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator a moment?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. He says he expects to make a statement after the bill passes showing how the revenue is raised and from what sources. Why can he not make that statement now? I have to vote for or against the bill, and I would like to know what I am doing.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, this bill has not yet passed its amendment stage. I do not know in what form it will emerge, and I can not possibly make an estimate until the amendments are all in and I know what the bill is to be.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know the Senator has made an extensive study of this question, and I want to ask him whether he can not, as far as we have gone, state from what source the revenue will come?

Mr. MOSES. I have stated that. I stated that yesterday in the course of the debate. I think this bill will raise something like \$50,000,000. I stated yesterday that I thought it would raise \$20,000,000 from parcel post. I have said that I thought it would raise \$3,000,000 from second-class matter, and twelve and a half millions from first class.

Mr. OVERMAN. I was out of the Chamber all day attending a committee meeting, and I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. MOSES. I understand that. Once more the eccentric vocabulary of the Senator from New York has led him astray. I am not at all discomfited by any situation that will arise in connection with this bill.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. MOSES. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. Is the Senator ever embarrassed?

Mr. MOSES. Oh, yes; frequently. All men of conscience are. [Laughter.]

I am sure that I am quite as anxious to grant postal-salary increases as the Senator from New York is. In fact, Mr. President, I think I am a little more desirous of granting them than he is, because I am not impeding the passage of the only measure that will grant them.

Mr. NORRIS obtained the floor.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from New Hampshire asked if the Senator from New York would vote for the bill. I think he was not in the Chamber when I said that I would vote for the bill, and that I remembered a famous Republican Governor of Michigan saying that he voted the Republican ticket but held his nose while he did so. I am going to hold my nose and vote for the bill, because I want to see brought about what the Senator from New Hampshire is so anxious to have done—increases given the postal employees.

Mr. MOSES. Then let us get to it. If the Senator has such a poor opinion of the bill as he is evidently trying to express one more element of disfavor in the bill certainly can not make it any worse for him. So let us get to it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska allow me to ask the Senator from New Hampshire one question before he starts his remarks?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood the Senator from New Hampshire to say that on the second-class matter there would probably be \$3,000,000 additional revenue raised, after the amendments had been adopted, and so on.

Mr. MOSES. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. How much does the Senator believe would be raised from the transient second-class matter?

Mr. MOSES. One million dollars.

Mr. HARRISON. Does he think there would be a loss or an increase in revenue in connection with the publisher's second-class matter?

Mr. MOSES. My impression is, as I have said more than once, that these rates will bring back into the mail a considerable portion of second-class matter which has been withdrawn from the mail, and the total revenue will be increased.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator does not think there will be a loss of a million six hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. MOSES. I do not.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me to have read and placed in the RECORD in this connection, because it touches this matter, a letter I have just received from the Postmaster General in answer to a request on my part that he give me the facts touching this question?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read.

The reading clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1925.

HON. PAT HARRISON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HARRISON: Replying to the inquiry from your office received over the phone, requesting information as to the amount of additional revenue, if any, which will be raised by the postage rates for second-class mail matter provided for in the bill S. 3674, as it now stands before the Senate with the changes that were adopted, I have to inform you as follows:

The additional revenue which would be raised on transient second-class matter; that is, publications entered as second class but mailed by the public would be approximately \$1,000,000 a year. The rates as provided for in the bill on publishers' second-class matter would result in a loss of revenues of approximately \$1,644,000.

This estimate does not include additional revenue which might be received if second-class matter now carried by freight should be diverted back to the mails. It is not believed that under the rates

stated there would be any considerable diversion. However, if there should be such a diversion, it is believed that the additional cost of transportation which would become necessary to provide for the carriage would be as much or greater than the additional revenue at the rates stated in the bill.

In reply to your further inquiry, I will say that the present rates on second-class matter do not make any distinction between newspapers and magazines, excepting that under present rates any publication maintained by and in the interest of any religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, or fraternal organization or association not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, the rate is $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents a pound for both reading and advertising matter carried any distance. As I understand, the bill as it now stands in the Senate continues this rate.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. NEW,
Postmaster General.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MOSES. During the years when the present Postmaster General and I served together in this Chamber I valued him highly as a friend and a colleague, but I did not always agree with his conclusions. Since he has become Postmaster General, I value him no less highly as a friend and an associate in the Government, and in this instance, I do not agree with his conclusions.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if the letter of the Postmaster General was written with a knowledge of the so-called Oddie amendment having been adopted?

Mr. HARRISON. The letter came to me this morning, following a request at about 11 o'clock for this information. So I have no doubt that it is up to date, and that is what I wanted.

Mr. NORRIS. Then he took the Oddie amendment into consideration when writing that letter?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; the Oddie amendment was a matter which came before the Senate yesterday.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me that what is happening now in the Senate on this very important measure illustrates so well the condition I tried to explain yesterday which exists in regard to the legislation that I can not refrain from again calling the attention of the Senate to it. We are seeking by the proposed bill to make a change in the perhaps greatest department of the Government, one at least that comes more intimately in connection with the life of the people of the country than any other department, one that enters into the business of all the people of the United States, one that goes into the homes of all the people, that has a close connection with their cost of living, with their method of living, with their business affairs, their social affairs, their religious affairs—everything connected with human life. When we undertake to make a change that shall go into all those things directly pertaining to the life of the people of the country we ought to be careful that we are doing it on the right kind of information. We ought to hesitate lest we make a mistake that would interfere with and turn over the method of living, the method of business, the method of society, and everything. It is a serious proposition, it seems to me.

I called attention yesterday to the fact that on the face of it it seems to me that we are doing it without sufficient information, because the bill that we are considering, if it is enacted into law, is only temporary and goes out of existence after 10 months' operation by its own terms. We are going to turn it upside down and have it upside down for 10 months and then turn it back again. We are going to interfere with everything for that length of time. It may be that it will turn out from experiment that it is all right, but I do not believe it will. It is at least a guess. Nobody knows. The experts do not agree.

The committee and the representatives of the committee who have the legislation in charge do not agree with the Postmaster General. They do not agree with the fact finding commission. They do not agree with anybody but themselves. They may be right. I do not know. I am not in a position to judge. I ought to be before I am called upon to cast my vote. I ought to have an opportunity fairly and conscientiously to vote upon the question. It is the same with every other Senator. We can not get away from that proposition. We are going into something blindly. If it were a little thing, I would not care much about it, but it is a great thing that enters, as I said, into the very existence of all the people of the country, of every farmer, and of every business institution.

It seems that yesterday the Senate adopted the so-called Oddie amendment. There seems to be a dispute here as to just what effect that will have. Outside of the more distant zones the author of the amendment, it seems to me, thinks it is going to reduce present rates on newspapers. I understood at the beginning of the consideration of the proposed legislation that the great reason why there was such a great deficit in the Post Office Department was because of second-class matter, the deficit being between \$70,000,000 and \$80,000,000, and now we are going to raise the amount of that deficit not from the class that causes the deficit, if the statements of the Senator from New Hampshire are true, not from the class of mail matter that brings about the deficit, but we are going to still further decrease the cost of that class of mail and thus increase the deficit from that portion of the mail business, and then we must raise the amount of the deficit from somewhere else. We must increase the rates some other place.

I may be wrong, but I have the conviction in my mind and fairly well established that it was second-class mail matter that was to blame for the large deficit in the Post Office Department. I am not one of those who believe that in operating the Post Office Department we should make a profit or that it should even pay its own way. There are a good many reasons why on second-class mail matter we should stand a deficit. But if there is any place in it where, without injury to legitimate business, we could increase the rates I want to do it. If there is any other place where we can legitimately increase the rates without injury I would like to do that, too. But I have not and no other Senator has evidence, except some very conflicting statements that lead us nowhere except in a hole, upon which to base an intelligent judgment or an intelligent decision.

Why should we do this? It is proposed here to increase the rates on parcel post. Before the George amendment was adopted I think it was conceded that the rates in the bill would bring in an additional revenue of about \$20,000,000. I am not sure that upon a full hearing of the case I would not be in favor of increasing the parcel-post rates, but I am not willing to increase them unless I have formed an opinion upon reliable evidence that we are justified in doing it.

We had a great fight in Congress, running over many years, in the matter of the establishment of the parcel post. It was a contested question that was bitterly fought in one Congress after another. There was bitter opposition to it. I was in the House of Representatives during that fight, and I remember the arguments that were made against it, the wonderful propaganda that went out over the country against it; but after due consideration it was established. I think it is conceded now that the objections made to it were to a great extent fanciful and did not in reality exist, though honestly made by many classes of people, for instance, small storekeepers, who themselves are utilizing it now in their own business. It is not the terrible thing they thought it was going to be. It has done a wonderful amount of good. I do not want to cripple it. If we are going to raise the bulk of this revenue on the parcel post and reduce still further in the near-by zones the cost of second-class mail matter that brings about at least a very large proportion of the deficit, it seems to me that is unfair. I do not believe we are justified in doing that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to ask the Senator from Nebraska about a phase of the parcel-post question that has just suggested itself to my mind. The chief increase, almost the whole increase, on parcel-post matter is the requirement that upon every parcel, without reference to its weight or its value, there shall be placed a 2-cent stamp. A parcel that weighs 1 pound now pays within the first 50 miles 5 cents. A parcel that weighs 70 pounds now pays within the first 50 miles 74 cents. The same increase is made under the bill on a parcel which only weighs 1 pound and now pays 5 cents that is made on a parcel which weighs 70 pounds and now pays 74 cents.

Mr. NORRIS. The object of the pending amendment is to strike out that 2-cent charge.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wanted to ask the Senator if that was not a very discriminatory increase?

Mr. NORRIS. When we figure it out on a percentage basis, it would be. I have not heard this argued, but I want to be entirely fair with those who propose such a tax. I suppose that it is levied on the theory that there is always an initial

charge that is about the same on a package regardless of its size or weight. I think it might be described as akin to the terminal charge on a package of freight.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator from Nebraska may remember the statement which I made when I reported the bill four weeks ago to-day. I pointed out that this service charge was in the same nature as the so-called pick-up charge authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission on all express packages, the pick-up charge being 35 cents on all packages.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, we would be glad to hear the conversation on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, it will all be in the Record.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from New York has a right to hear it. The conversation was not very audible. The Senator from New Hampshire called attention to a statement he made—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. Just let me make this statement. The conversation was low and other Senators are entitled to know what it was about. I remember distinctly that when the Senator from New Hampshire said it, he made an impression on me that there is some reason behind it. I am not saying that there should not be some charge of this kind, but the 2-cent charge put on every parcel that goes into the Post Office Department was akin, the Senator from New Hampshire very well said, to what is called the pick-up charge of the express companies that they put on all packages. The pick-up charge is 35 cents.

Mr. MOSES. Yes; and is authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, there is a difference between the pick-up charge and this charge because the express company goes after the package and gets it, as I understand it. The Post Office Department does not do that. We have to deliver a parcel-post package to the Post Office Department.

Mr. MOSES. If I may interject at that point, we have to deliver it to the Post Office Department at some point, not necessarily at the central post office.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I did not mean that.

Mr. MOSES. If it is delivered in this city, for example, at a postal station near the Senator's residence in Cleveland Park, it is there picked up by a Post Office Department wagon and taken to the city post office which, as the Senator knows, is adjacent to the railroad station.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, by whatever name we may call this additional 2-cent charge, it is in effect increasing the rate that the sender pays upon his package. If the package takes the lowest or minimum charge, being of minimum size and weight, the sender has to pay an increase that amounts to nearly 100 per cent.

Mr. NORRIS. It would not be that much, but it would be a large percentage.

Mr. MOSES. Is not the Senator losing sight of the fact that we have transferred all packages of less than four ounces to the third class, where the rate is exactly the same and where there is no service charge?

Mr. SIMMONS. The point I am making is that when we imposed this charge we regulated it by weight. Now, when we go to increase the charge we do not consider weight at all; we impose the same amount of increase upon a 1-pound package that we do upon a 70-pound package.

Mr. MOSES. That is true.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is out of harmony with the law as it now stands, which was based upon weight.

Mr. MOSES. Would the Senator favor making a service charge of \$1.40 on a 70-pound package?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; Mr. President. I am simply objecting to this increase being based upon a theory so utterly at variance with the principle of the original parcel post act.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, of course, the service charge is supposed to be for the service rendered on a package, and it is just the same for a 4-ounce package as it is for one of 70 pounds.

Mr. SIMMONS. Call it service, or whatever it may be called, it is an additional charge.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there are provisions in this bill which practically every Senator very earnestly favors. We have added an amendment which, while to my mind it is entirely foreign so far as the subject matter is concerned to the title of the bill, would put on the statute books a law that we ought to have there. So there are a good many reasons why Senators are attracted to the bill and intend to vote for it. Nearly everybody has felt, it is conceded even by the President who vetoed the former bill, that the wage increases provided for in the vetoed bill and likewise in the

pending bill are just and that they ought to be enacted into law.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] providing for publicity of campaign expenses, I think, would meet with unanimous approval of this body. Those are good provisions; we should all like to have them enacted into law; but, Mr. President, are we justified in singling out, for instance, the people of the country who patronize the parcel post and saying to them, "You must bear the burden"? In order to give somebody else what they are entitled to, are we going to do an injustice to somebody else? Are we going to say to those who send parcels through the mail, "You must pay for the deficit caused by the carriage of second-class mail matter"? Are we going to say that though second-class mail matter is to blame for a large part of the deficit, we will decrease the rates that must be paid by second-class matter in some of the zones still lower than those they now pay, which are admitted already to be less than the cost to the Government to carry mail matter? Can we justify ourselves in adding a burden of \$20,000,000 upon those who patronize the parcel post in order to accomplish some good to those who are employed in the Post Office Department, and at the same time still further liberate second-class mail matter from the payment of the charges which they should contribute in keeping in operation the great Post Office Department?

Mr. President, I do not understand why we should take that view of it. I can not, for the life of me, understand why we should take that class of mail matter carried by the Post Office Department which causes the largest deficit and still further lower the rates on such matter, thus making the deficit larger, and then push it over on to somebody else.

Again, Mr. President, are we going to get the increased amount of revenue from second-class matter which has been prophesied here? The Postmaster General's letter, which was just read from the desk, discloses that, according to his estimate, there will be a decrease in revenue from a large portion of the second-class mail matter. The estimate of the Senator from New Hampshire is based, I take it, in part on his theory that some of the second-class mail matter which has been driven from the Post Office Department will return and make use of the department's facilities. I have great faith in the Senator's judgment, and if he were passing upon a case and had all the evidence before him, both pro and con, and I had to follow his judgment as to his conclusions, I would not very much fear that I should go wrong; but as he said about the Postmaster General's estimate, I can not follow him in his estimate. I do not believe that any of this class of mail matter will return to the Post Office Department, and I am not anxious that it should. If it can only be transported by the Post Office Department at a loss, and the publishers can transport it cheaper in some other way, bid them God speed and let them use the cheapest method of transportation possible. I do not understand why we should be anxious to get more business of a particular kind when we are losing money on it, anyway; or even if we were making money, if those who are publishing the newspapers and the periodicals can transport their publications more cheaply by some other method, we ought not to put a straw in their way. Let them carry on their business as cheaply as possible.

Mr. President, in my humble judgment, there will be no return to the Post Office Department of second-class mail matter. The periodicals that now go by freight across the country to be deposited in the post offices at various places will still continue to do so; it is the most economical way to do it; when it can be hauled in a freight train at a much less rate that is the way it will be hauled and that is the way it ought to be hauled. So we shall get no increase in that respect, as the Postmaster General has stated, and even if we should the increased cost of handling would absorb any increase of revenue which might thereby be obtained.

If we shall obliterate that item, omit it from our calculation, then we shall have a revenue coming from the second-class mail matter less than we now have. No Senator can justify himself in voting for a bill that will have that kind of result. Instead of increasing the revenue from second-class matter, I think, so far as the evidence which we have is concerned, it discloses the fact that we are going to get less revenue under the bill as it now stands than we get under the existing law; and hence that the deficit is going to be greater.

Can we justify ourselves now in putting the burden of making up the deficit on to the parcel post? I do not believe we ought to take any action in regard to the parcel post in the dark. That service is something which, as I said a while ago, came about from a long contest, a contest for years. It was established after that contest. No one denies the justifica-

tion for it now, and I would not want to take any action that would cripple it, although, as I previously stated, if upon a full and fair hearing it should be disclosed that the revenues ought to be increased or could be increased or the method of handling the service changed so as to make its administration more economical, I would favor such action. However, we have not light enough now to enable us to vote intelligently upon this proposition.

Senators, that being the condition, as is practically admitted by everybody, why should we not take that part of the bill which, after all, ought to have no connection with any other part—the part dealing with the increase of salaries—and act upon that intelligently? Put with it section 217, as I recall, which provides for an investigation of this whole question by a joint committee of the two Houses, and then, when the report of that joint committee shall come in, we can act intelligently upon all these other matters about which we are now groping in the dark.

Such a course ought to satisfy President Coolidge, believing as he does and as he has said he does, in increased salaries for the postal employees. The first step is to pass the bill and provide in it for the appointment of a joint committee to look into this matter and to ascertain the facts and figures so that we may legislate logically and intelligently. We can not enact good legislation unless we do that. Either we must make such an investigation or somebody else must discharge that duty. We must have the facts before we can legislate intelligently. That is conceded by those who are behind this bill, because they incorporated the provision for a joint committee in the bill and because they have provided that the new rates which are proposed shall be only temporary; that they shall last only for 10 months. That being conceded, why not proceed as we ordinarily would? Could anybody find fault with us? Is the President going to be so arbitrary with those who follow him blindly in this body as to require them to do an illogical and perhaps an unjust thing to millions of our people merely to satisfy an opinion or a whim?

In order merely to do justice to which it is conceded the employees of the Post Office Department are entitled, are we going to be compelled by presidential edict to do an injustice to a larger number of our people in the country by compelling them to pay the great bulk of the cost of the increased salaries? I do not believe that is reasonable; I do not believe that any President would demand it; and it seems to me Senators are very illogical when they say we must take such action in order to obviate a presidential veto.

If I believed that to be true, Mr. President, I would still follow the course I have suggested; but I can not believe that the President of the United States would be so unreasonable, even assuming that he has the power to do all that anybody has ever said that he could do, as to say we must jump in the dark here and impose a burden on Tom, Dick, or Harry without knowing whether or not it should be so imposed, and make them bear it in order to give certain Government employees just salaries. The first step which is conceded to be necessary in order to get the facts is to investigate the Post Office Department and ascertain where we can and where we ought to increase the postal revenues; to find out where the deficit really occurs, for even that is not a question in agreement here. That is what we must do. If we put that much in this bill, it seems to me it should be satisfactory to any reasonable mind or to any fair man. No man, whether he be President or not, has a right to ask any more. That much he has a right to ask, and when that is done we have performed our duty.

If a joint committee is not the proper instrumentality to secure this information, I have no objection to any other method or to any other method in addition to that, but we have not the information now and we have to have it in order logically and intelligently to legislate on this great question. We ought not to legislate until we do have it. Therefore, it seems to me this amendment ought to be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. MOSES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. OVERMAN. I was about to make the same suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Butler	Curtis	Fletcher
Bayard	Cameron	Dale	Frazier
Bingham	Capper	Dial	George
Borah	Caraway	Dill	Gerry
Brookhart	Copeland	Edge	Glass
Broussard	Couzens	Ferris	Gooding
Bruce	Cummins	Fess	Hale

Harrell	McKellar	Pepper	Sterling
Harris	McKinley	Phipps	Swanson
Harrison	McLean	Ralston	Trammell
Heflin	McNary	Reed, Pa.	Wadsworth
Howell	Mayfield	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Johnson, Calif.	Means	Shields	Warren
Johnson, Minn.	Metcalf	Shipstead	Watson
Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Shortridge	Weller
Jones, Wash.	Neely	Simmons	Wheeler
Kendrick	Norbeck	Smoot	Willis
Keyes	Norris	Spencer	
King	Odell	Stanfield	
McCormick	Overman	Stanley	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. NORRIS (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FRAZIER. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. LADD] is unavoidably detained. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. BROUSSARD. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. RANDELL] on official business. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that if the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] were present, they would all vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of New Mexico (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. I believe he has not voted. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. STANLEY (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], and will let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—38

Brookhart	Gerry	Jones, N. Mex.	Sheppard
Broussard	Glass	Kendrick	Shields
Bruce	Gooding	McKellar	Shipstead
Caraway	Harris	Mayfield	Simmons
Copeland	Harrison	Neely	Stanley
Dial	Heflin	Norbeck	Swanson
Fletcher	Howell	Norris	Trammell
Frazier	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
George	Johnson, Minn.	Ralston	Wheeler

NAYS—39

Ball	Dill	McKinley	Shortridge
Bayard	Edge	McLean	Smoot
Bingham	Ferris	McNary	Spencer
Borah	Fess	Means	Stanfield
Butler	Hale	Metcalf	Sterling
Cameron	Harrell	Moses	Wadsworth
Couzens	Jones, Wash.	Odell	Warren
Cummins	Keyes	Pepper	Watson
Curtis	King	Phipps	Willis
Dale	McCormick	Reed, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—21

Asburst	Fernald	Pittman	Underwood
Bursum	Greene	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Capper	Ladd	Reed, Mo.	Weller
Edwards	La Follette	Robinson	
Elkins	Lenroot	Smith	
Ernst	Owen	Stephens	

So Mr. HARRISON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, after the action of the Senate on this amendment Senators can see exactly what the purpose of this bill is. Everybody concedes that these employees ought to have an increase of salary. The President has relented on that and recognized the justice of it, and all that he has required is that we shall provide a means of furnishing the money to pay the increase. What has the Senate decided as to where most of this money shall come from? That it shall come from fourth-class matter, parcel post. In other words, the Senate is willing to increase the salaries of the

postal clerks and postal employees provided the farmers of the country will furnish more than one-third of the money through increased rates on parcel post.

That is a gross injustice. Why stay here to try to get legislation to relieve the farmer, why call an extra session to relieve the farmer, when we put additional burdens on him every time we try to give something to some one else?

I was on the joint commission of the House and Senate which stayed here all summer to provide the means of establishing a parcel post. As the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has well said, it was fought from beginning to end. The express companies and the railroad companies and the special interests fought the parcel post from start to finish. The Senate was represented on that joint commission by Senator Bourne, who at that time was chairman of the Post Office Committee, Senator Bristow, of Kansas, and myself. After six months of hearings we brought to the Senate a provision for the establishment of a parcel post as now provided. Every effort to increase its usefulness has been fought in this body.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator states, as I understand him, that one-third of the increases will be borne by the farmers.

Mr. SWANSON. More than one-third.

Mr. KING. My recollection of statements repeatedly made on the floor of the Senate during the debate, now and in the past, is that only a small percentage, one and a fraction per cent, of parcel post, originated with the farmers, and about 7 or 8 per cent was delivered to the farmers.

Mr. SWANSON. That is true; but who pays it?

Mr. KING. So that the farmer would not be paying it all, as the Senator has said.

Mr. SWANSON. If a farmer, instead of taking a day to go to a little town in his county, will order what he wants by postal card, and the merchant sends it over by parcel post and saves the farmer a day in going to the town to buy what he wants, he gets the advantage of having his purchases sent to him instead of losing a day's work in going to get them.

Mr. NORBECK and Mr. GEORGE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota, as he rose first.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia whether he does not believe that these costs are carried on to the ultimate consumer; that business will pass them on to customers?

Mr. SWANSON. Everybody knows that is so.

Mr. NORBECK. Then, why say that \$20,000,000 goes to the farmers? Does not practically all of it ultimately reach them?

Mr. SWANSON. Twenty million dollars is a special burden on the parcel post. The farmers are not all the people in the country, but the farmers are practically the only people who use the parcel post and rural delivery.

Mr. NORBECK. But the others can protect themselves by passing the costs on. It is the customer who pays. If the laboring man can get some salary increase to protect him, he is taken care of, but if the farmer can not get an increase in the price of his products, then he is carrying the whole load, is he not?

Mr. SWANSON. Of course.

Mr. NORBECK. One more matter. Perhaps I misunderstood the attitude of the President. As I recall, the President's veto message addressed to the Congress stated that an investigation had been made by the Post Office Department that covered cities and towns of all sizes in the United States, and it was found that postal employees received higher salaries than others in like employment. I have seen no evidence that he has changed his opinion in that matter.

I suggest to the Senator from Virginia that the way to keep this burden from falling upon the farmer is to vote against the bill, and then he will be sure that the farmer will not get the burden. I had a good deal of pressure put on me from one of the cities in my State, a county seat, my correspondents insisting that seventeen or eighteen hundred dollars was not a living wage. So I telegraphed the county clerk up there to see what salaries were being paid to employees in the courthouse—and that is one of the largest counties in South Dakota. The reply came back that on an average they are paying \$1,056; and the highest salary paid is \$100 a month. Still they are asking us to raise the salaries of these seventeen or eighteen hundred dollar clerks about \$300 a year and to put the increases on the farmers, of course.

Mr. SWANSON. Now I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I just wanted to say, in answer to the statement made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who has left the Chamber, that it has been often repeated here that only 1½ per cent of parcel post originates on rural routes. That is true according to the fact finding commission's report, and I take it that that is an accurate statement. It has been often stated that only about 9 per cent of the parcel-post packages were delivered on rural routes. But I have called attention once before, and I want to emphasize it now, to the fact that those two percentages combined do not represent the total service of parcel post to the farmers, because, as I stated—a statement which is borne out by the cost ascertainment report—44 per cent of all the money orders in the United States are sold at third and fourth class post offices, and the Post Office Department itself indicates its settled conviction that the majority of those money orders are purchased by farmers, men living on the rural routes and in the country, and represent business finally going through the postal system as parcel post. In other words, the mere number of packages actually collected on the rural routes and the mere number of packages actually delivered on the rural routes do not indicate, either separately or combined, the total service of parcel post to the American farmer. Mr. Stewart, of the Post Office Department, stated that it is the opinion of the best informed men in the service that approximately 35 per cent of all parcel post originates with or is delivered to the farmer.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, what does that disclose? It is well for us to face the issue. People buy where they can buy the cheapest, and fourth-class matter, which has had a deficiency, in round numbers, of only \$7,000,000, will have it increased to twenty millions. In other words, fourth-class matter, in which parcel post is included, half of it originating with country people—farmers—and practically the other half of it with the laboring masses of the people, pays more than one-third of the salary increases provided under this bill for postal employees.

If the letter read by the Senator from Mississippi is correct, there is a reduction of rates on second-class matter. We hear no clamor from users of that class of mail. I would like to ask the Senator in charge of this bill if that statement by the Postmaster General is true, if there will be a reduction of rates rather than an increase on second-class matter?

Mr. MOSES. If the Senator from Virginia had been a little more constant in attendance, he would have learned that I have already twice said "no" in answer to that very question.

Mr. SWANSON. The Postmaster General is wrong?

Mr. MOSES. I have expressed that opinion.

Mr. SWANSON. In other words, then, you want to increase about \$3,000,000 the revenue on second-class matter. Now you want to pass a bill, in this situation, without investigation to find who would pay these increases of salaries to the postal employees, who, I think, are clearly entitled to the increases. As the Senator from Nebraska well said, in order to meet a political situation, in order to give the President an excuse for signing a bill to increase the salaries of these postal employees this ill-digested, ill-considered bill is to be passed and remain on the statute books for eight months. It would unsettle business. A great many businesses would be hurt and some destroyed in trying to readjust themselves to it. It is nothing in the world but a subterfuge to give an excuse for failing to pass a bill over the President's veto.

It can not be disputed that on fourth-class matter, the chief part of which is parcel post, from a deficit of seven millions you go to a surplus of thirteen millions, increasing \$20,000,000 on that class of business. The masses of the people, one-half the country people, one-half the laboring people in the cities, who use parcel post instead of special delivery, will bear the burden.

I say, the bill affects business enterprises which have been created under the present system, and it is not just to make those people pay more than one-third of the increases provided by this bill, which are to go to pay the salaries of the postal employees.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. NORBECK. What percentage of Virginia farmers would the Senator estimate get as good salaries as do the post office employees, even allowing for the advantage of living on a farm?

Mr. SWANSON. I am not prepared to say; but I think the average Virginia farmer would not get as much. Most of these postal employees live in cities, and consequently they have rent to pay, and have other expenses, different from those the farmer would have, and I have not heard any protest from

farmers against a proper increase in salaries. What I object to on behalf of the farmer is this, when you pay these salaries, a large proportion of which go to those who live in the cities, you tax the country people to raise the increased revenue, as usual, even conceding it is a just increase. Why should parcel post, why should fourth-class mail matter be taxed, and the burden ultimately put on that class of people?

Mr. NORBECK. In other words, we are giving one class \$300 a year at the expense of another class that is getting less.

Mr. SWANSON. Of course, they might be getting less, but in the city folks have to pay rent and incur other expenses, and I am not prepared to say—

Mr. NORBECK. The Senator is familiar with the report made of an extensive investigation by the Agricultural Department of pre-war conditions, which showed that the average farmer of the United States had an income of \$600 a year, of which \$200 was cash, and \$400 was the advantage of living on a farm. We will all agree that conditions have become worse since. Still, they propose to put this burden on the farmers.

Mr. SWANSON. The second objection to this increase is that it is put on a class of mail matter that is mostly used by the farmers.

Senators may vote for this bill. I know it is scheduled to go through. I can tell from the votes recorded on every issue which has come up that the bill will pass the Senate.

There is little clamor on account of it, because the people who will bear the burden can not be heard here. They have few papers representing them. They can not create sentiment here. But if this bill passes the Senate and the House, and these burdens are put where this bill attempts to place them, the injustice of it will be so glaring that it will not appeal to the spirit of fairness and justice of the American people; it will not be an act of legislation which will meet their approval.

I want simply to say in conclusion that I shall vote against the passage of this bill. First, I believe it was improper to originate a tax measure like this in the Senate. I believe it is unconstitutional. I believe it is contrary to the very principles of our Government to originate in the Senate a bill the main feature of which is to raise \$63,000,000 of revenue. I do not believe the House of Representatives will acquiesce in that practice. I believe it will send the bill back. If such a policy is to exist between the House and the Senate it will mean that in the future the taxing power of the Government will be transferred from the House of Representatives, as fixed by the Constitution, to the Senate of the United States.

The main purpose of this bill is to provide revenue to answer an objection presented by the President. It can not be defended. It is a subterfuge. The issue was precipitated because the President would not consent to increases of salaries unless the revenue were provided.

I believe we can devise better methods of raising the revenue than by putting one-third of the increase on fourth-class mail matter. I believe it can more justly be raised from other sources than by an imposition of these burdens on that class of matter.

I shall vote against the bill because I believe it jeopardizes parcel post, because it is an effort in behalf of those who have for years fought parcel post, with its advantages to the rural sections and the other sections, and people who have been blessed by it against extortionate express rates.

Under these circumstances I believe the right thing to do is to defeat this bill, or eliminate that provision of it which provides for an increase of postal rates, and if taxation must be provided to take care of these salaries, let the House of Representatives, which, under the Constitution, has the taxing power of the Government, amend it and send it back to us.

That is the constitutional way to do it. That is the fair way to do it. That is the just way to do it. Consequently when the bill comes to its final passage I shall vote against it.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, the discussion of this measure has at last reached the political or filibustering or silly stage. All the questions of constitutionality of one sort and another which the Senator from Virginia brings forward have been passed upon, and by an adequate majority the Senate has made its decision. I can not forbear, however, from calling the Senator's attention to the tremendous burden which he assumes the bill will lay upon the farmers of the country.

There are 30,000,000 people served by the rural free delivery routes in the United States. With the transfer of 4-ounce packages from the fourth to the third class, as provided by the bill as it now stands, the number of packages passing through the parcel post will be approximately 900,000,000 a year. The amount of business originating on the rural free

delivery routes and delivered on the rural free delivery routes is something like 10 per cent; in other words, 90,000,000 packages a year, upon which the burden will be 2 cents a package, or \$1,800,000 per year, which, divided among the 30,000,000 people living on the rural free delivery routes, means that the bowed back of each of the farmers of the country will be pressed down by the tremendous burden of 6 cents per year.

Mr. SWANSON. Did the Senator from New Hampshire hear the statement of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I make a parliamentary inquiry? As I understand it, the section we are now considering has been reconsidered and is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the committee amendment is now before the Senate on reconsideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I move, on page 44, line 8, to strike out "2 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "1 cent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee moves an amendment, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 44, line 8, the Senator from Tennessee moves to strike out "2 cents" and insert "1 cent," making the service charge for each parcel of fourth-class matter 1 cent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to state briefly my reason for proposing the amendment. According to the figures just given by the Senator from New Hampshire, there being 900,000,000 packages, at 1 cent each under the proposed amendment they would bring in \$9,000,000 per year. There is a loss, according to the report of the commission, of only \$7,000,000 per year. If that report is correct, and I believe it is substantially correct, then, if we adopt the amendment I have offered, the parcel post will pay its way and \$2,000,000 besides. I do not think we ought to burden the parcel post with any greater tax than is necessary to make it pay its own way.

Why should we put an additional burden upon the parcel post? We do not do it on any other class of mail matter, I believe, except first class. Letters are the only thing. There may be one other inconsequential class that brings more than it costs, but if my amendment is adopted and the charge is made 1 cent per package, instead of 2 cents, it will make the parcel post more than pay its own way. It seems to me that in the interest of fairness and equity and good legislation we ought to adopt the amendment and make the charge 1 cent instead of 2 cents.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] a question. Is the Senator's committee in possession of any estimate made by the Post Office Department as to the amount of revenue that will be derived from these several increases?

Mr. MOSES. Oh, yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not recall that the Senator has filed that estimate.

Mr. MOSES. No. As I said earlier in the day, the bill is still in its amended stage, and until we know whether these amendments designed to emasculate the measure and defeat it are adopted I shall decline to make any estimate of the total amount of revenue to be raised.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; but the question I asked the Senator did not relate to the amount that would be raised by the amended bill. I ask if he had any estimate from the Post Office Department showing the amount of revenue that would be raised by reason of each one of the several increases proposed by the committee.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator wants to know if there is any estimate from the Post Office Department regarding the amount of revenue to be raised by the bill as amended by the subcommittee.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and as reported to the Senate.

Mr. MOSES. That has been put in the RECORD several times, showing in round numbers about \$30,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does that estimate show what will be derived from each one of the increases?

Mr. MOSES. Yes; and that has been stated in a speech by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. SIMMONS. Has the estimate itself been placed in the RECORD?

Mr. MOSES. It was contained in a speech of the Senator from South Dakota, and the table, I think, appears in his speech.

Mr. SWANSON. I understood the Senator had discarded the estimates made by the Post Office Department except where they agree with him.

Mr. MOSES. I would not say that. I am skeptical about a great many of them. I am glad to see the Senator from Tennessee is now so heartily in accord with what the Post Office Department said. He rarely has been during my service with him on the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Sometimes I am and sometimes I am not. Mr. SIMMONS. I understood the Senator from New Hampshire, in his first very illuminating statement on this matter, to indicate that his committee had received some estimates based upon the fact finding commission's report, but that the committee discarded their estimates and proceeded upon estimates which they themselves made. Am I correct about that?

Mr. MOSES. Speaking generally the Senator made a correct statement. However, what I said was this: I think that the Post Office Department brought in a detailed estimate of the amount of revenue to be raised by the increases in rates carried in the bill as originally introduced. In some of those cases the committee made no changes. Of course, where we made changes we had to make our own estimates because, the Senator will remember, the bill was reported on the 2d day of January. If the Senator from North Carolina is trying to get from the Senator from New Hampshire an indorsement of all the figures produced by the Post Office Department, let me say to him that his labor will be in vain.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not trying to do anything except to get information. I understood that this morning a letter had come to the Senate from the Postmaster General.

Mr. MOSES. That is true.

Mr. SIMMONS. In which he expressed the opinion that the bill as now amended as to second-class mail matter would not increase the revenue from that source, but would diminish the revenue from that source.

Mr. MOSES. The Postmaster General said that.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood from the Senator's first speech that the fact finding commission, which has addressed itself to the consideration of the very matter we are now discussing and the committee had differed. I was trying to find out and only trying to find out whether there was an authoritative statement from the Post Office Department giving the Senate information as to the amount of revenue estimated by them which would be realized from each of the several items which have been increased. If any such has been filed I have not been able to find it, and I would be thankful to the Senator if he would now refer me to it, because in the present state of the discussion that becomes exceedingly important.

Mr. MOSES. I do not see how it does become important to the Senator, since he said yesterday that he did not intend to vote for the bill, anyway.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not say so.

Mr. MOSES. I beg the Senator's pardon, but I understood him to say so.

Mr. SIMMONS. I said that whether I would vote for the bill would depend upon the adoption of amendments that had not been acted upon at that time.

Mr. MOSES. In answer to the Senator's inquiry, the only statement that has come from the Post Office Department, so far as I know, was contained in the letter of the Postmaster General which was read at the desk this morning at the request of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. As to whether that is an authoritative statement I decline to pass judgment.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is not referring to the letter of the Postmaster General?

Mr. MOSES. Yes; I am.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator question his competency and authority to make a statement with reference to a matter connected with the department of which he is the head?

Mr. MOSES. Oh, no; not his authority to make a statement, but I question the validity of some of the conclusions which he reaches, and I said so when the letter was read.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to ask the Senator if he or his committee have made any investigations outside of the report of the fact finding commission and the report of the Post Office Department which would enable him or the committee to reach a satisfactory conclusion as to the effect upon postal revenues of these increases?

Mr. MOSES. Satisfactory to whom—to me?

Mr. SIMMONS. To the committee.

Mr. MOSES. Satisfactory to me, at any rate.

Mr. SIMMONS. And the Senator simply says to the Senate that according to his estimate and the estimate of his associates upon the subcommittee, the amount of revenue from the different increases proposed by the committee was placed at about \$50,000,000?

Mr. MOSES. No; it can not be stated quite as compactly as that.

The Post Office Department estimated that the bill as sent here from the department would raise about \$68,000,000. The subcommittee made certain changes in the rates, and the subcommittee, from such information as they possessed—and the committee had some information—estimated that the bill as amended by them would produce approximately \$50,000,000, though it might be a few millions more or it might be a few million dollars less. The Postmaster General in the letter to the Senator from Mississippi said that the bill as amended will produce, in round numbers, \$30,000,000. That is all the information I have, and I place it freely at the disposal of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thank the Senator; but I think that we have reached a point in the discussion of the bill which makes it very important that the Senate should have some definite estimate by some source that is qualified to make an estimate as to what amount of revenue will probably be realized by the Government from each of the four classes of mail matter from the increased rates in these several classes. The Senator from New Hampshire suggests to me, in an aside, that I had questioned his capability. I do not mean to say that the Senator is not entirely capable of making such an estimate provided he were in possession of the facts upon which a reliable estimate could be made.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from New Hampshire has audaciously claimed that he is just that person.

Mr. SIMMONS. I rather think so. At any rate, the minds of Senators, if I understand the situation, are in a state of confusion and uncertainty and doubt as to what would probably be the amount of revenue reasonably to be expected, either under the bill as reported by the committee or under the bill as amended by the Senate.

Mr. MOSES. May I make an appeal to the Senator from North Carolina?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to say, if the Senator will pardon me for just a minute, that we have never, since I have been here, entered upon the consideration of any tariff measure or of any revenue measure or any measure levying taxes without the committee in charge of the measure presenting to the Senate at the time a detailed statement made, not by itself but by the Treasury Department, of the amount of revenue that might be expected from the various and sundry taxes and increases proposed. And again, after action on the various amendments and before final action on the bill, it has been the custom to file the revised estimates made by the experts of the department, showing what would be the effect upon the original estimate of the amendments made by the Senate. The Senator says there was a general estimate in this instance presented by the Senator from South Dakota in his opening speech. I assume that is true, though it escaped me, but no specific estimate from the Post Office Department in reference to this bill as reported or as amended has been made to the Senate, and none is on file; neither have we been able to get any information from the committee than such as is manifestly nothing more than a mere guess.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understood from the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], the estimate of the Post Office Department is that the bill which is now before the Senate would yield about \$30,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I thought; but the Senator from New Hampshire now says \$50,000,000.

Mr. SWANSON. Of course, that is merely the opinion, that is the guess, of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SIMMONS. Now, the Senator from Virginia says the estimate of the Post Office Department is that the yield would be \$30,000,000. The Senator from New Hampshire at one time said the Post Office Department estimated that the bill would yield \$66,000,000.

Mr. SWANSON. That was the bill as originally introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. I should like to have the Senator from New Hampshire say whether or not I quoted him correctly. I understood the Senator from New Hampshire to say a short while ago that the Post Office Department estimated that this bill as it now stands would yield an increase of about \$30,000,000 in revenue?

Mr. MOSES. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. But then, as I understand further, if the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] will indulge me for a moment, he also stated that \$20,000,000 of that \$30,000,000 will come from fourth-class mail matter?

Mr. MOSES. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. SWANSON. How much is expected to be raised from fourth-class mail matter if the bill shall become a law as it is framed up to this time?

Mr. MOSES. About \$20,000,000.

Mr. SWANSON. That is on fourth-class mail matter?

Mr. MOSES. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. That statement being true, if the Post Office Department is correct that the increase of revenue will be \$30,000,000—

Mr. MOSES. No.

Mr. SWANSON. Then the Senator was mistaken in his estimate?

Mr. MOSES. No. The estimate of the Post Office Department was made before the adoption on yesterday of the amendment with reference to fourth-class mail matter. As I explained to the Senate yesterday afternoon, the printed bill was erroneous and an amendment was submitted which corrected the error. Now, as the bill stands for the consideration of the Senate, I do not know what it would raise, for I have never figured it out. The Post Office Department originally figured that we would get something like a million dollars—

Mr. SWANSON. A million dollars out of what?

Mr. MOSES. Out of fourth-class mail matter under the erroneous rates as printed in the bill. As the committee intended to introduce them and under the rates which the Senate adopted yesterday, I will say again, although I suppose the Senator from Virginia, like the Senator from New York, wants me to say it over and over again, \$20,000,000 a year, in round numbers, is the estimate.

Mr. SWANSON. That is from fourth-class matter?

Mr. MOSES. Yes; from fourth-class matter.

Mr. SWANSON. Then, if \$20,000,000 is to be obtained from that source, what is the estimate of the department for the residue?

Mr. MOSES. I do not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. SWANSON. I say, if the department estimated a total increase of \$30,000,000, but did not estimate that the rates on fourth-class mail matter would yield \$20,000,000, what would be the present estimate of the department of the aggregate?

Mr. MOSES. What would the department's figures for the entire bill be?

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator said the department figured that about a million dollars would be derived from the parcel-post rates.

Mr. MOSES. As I remember; yes.

Mr. SWANSON. On fourth-class mail matter?

Mr. MOSES. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. And \$30,000,000 for the entire bill?

Mr. MOSES. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. Then, if \$20,000,000 will be derived from the increased rates on fourth-class mail matter, the aggregate would be nearly \$50,000,000 under the department's own figures, would it not?

Mr. MOSES. That is what I have said.

Mr. SWANSON. I did not hear the Senator say it.

Mr. MOSES. I did not say that was the department's estimate.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator has a way of talking to himself.

Mr. MOSES. I did not say they were the department's own figures, because that did not make much difference to me. I said I estimated that this bill would produce something like \$50,000,000—a few million dollars one way or the other; I can not say.

Mr. SWANSON. From what item, as the bill now stands, does the Senator get the other \$30,000,000?

Mr. MOSES. From all the other items.

Mr. SWANSON. Could the Senator give the Senate an idea as to that?

Mr. MOSES. I intend to do so when the bill shall have passed the amendment stage, but I do not intend now to try to make any detailed estimate of what the bill will produce until the amendment stage has been passed. For instance, if the amendment now proposed should be agreed to, it would take \$9,000,000 out of the revenue; and the taking of \$9,000,000 out of the revenue, I want to say to any Senator interested in the bill, will be fatal to the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is exactly what I wanted to ascertain—whether it was the purpose of the Senator in charge of this bill before we finally vote upon it to file an estimate of

the amount of revenue that will be realized from the bill as amended before we are required to act upon it. I understand the Senator now to say that that is his purpose, but the Senator said he could not do that until after we have passed the amendment stage.

Mr. MOSES. If the amendment now proposed shall not be agreed to, if the Senate will refrain from biting this juicy morsel out of the body of this bill, it is my opinion that the bill will raise approximately \$50,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, the Senator is not giving us anything except a general statement based upon his own opinion.

Mr. MOSES. I am afraid the Senator will have to be content with that for the present.

Mr. SIMMONS. He is not giving us an estimate made by experts or official authority of the Post Office Department and based on official data or experience in dealing with these matters.

Mr. President, the only rate that is imposed in this bill that will yield a definitely certain revenue the amount of which can be easily calculated by a layman is that upon parcel-post packages.

Mr. MOSES. And first-class mail.

Mr. SIMMONS. And perhaps first-class mail, as the Senator says. Given the number of parcel-post packages that pass through the mail, it is a mere mathematical calculation as to what the increased rates upon fourth-class mail matter will produce. If there are 1,000,000,000 packages, and 2 cents is added to the cost of transmitting each package, we know that the bill will raise from that source \$20,000,000.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, no.

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, I am giving the statement of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and I suppose he probably had the information as to the number of parcels handled and had made the calculation before he made the statement.

Mr. MOSES. I will not attempt to correct the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator has trouble when he does undertake to do so sometimes.

Mr. MOSES. Not in dealing with facts.

Mr. SIMMONS. As he also has trouble in dealing with some other Senators. The Senator from Mississippi is generally fairly accurate in his statements.

But whether the amount is \$20,000,000 or \$18,000,000, the point I am making is that we know as a mathematical calculation, because the number of parcel-post packages passing through the mails can be readily, I assume, ascertained, and there is, I presume, no serious dispute as to the approximate number of these parcels.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, yes, there is.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator a little while ago said the number was something like 900,000,000.

Mr. MOSES. Approximately.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very well, approximately. The Senator from Mississippi estimated the number to be 1,000,000,000. That is the only difference between them. It is the difference probably between \$18,000,000 and \$20,000,000, but we know with fair accuracy about the amount of revenue that would be realized from this additional tax placed upon the parcels post. We do not, however, know that with reference to many other increases made in this bill, with possible exception of first-class mail matter.

Mr. MOSES. If the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. SIMMONS. It is a very real controversy here to-day as to whether the amount of revenue that will be realized from second-class matter is increased as a result of the Senate amendment or whether it is reduced; that is to say, whether we will raise more money under the rates proposed by this bill as now amended on second-class mail matter than we are now raising under the present law on second-class postal matter. The Senator from New Hampshire estimates that we will raise about \$3,000,000 more. That is merely his estimate or guess. The Post Office Department, as I understand it, estimates that the bill as amended will not raise as much from fourth-class mail matter, but that so raised will be between \$600,000 and \$700,000 less than under the present law. So, Mr. President, the Senate is absolutely in the dark as to the effect of the rates in this bill as now amended upon second-class mail matter.

I think the same situation of uncertainty exists as to other rates, but it is definitely certain that as to the parcel post the users of that great service will have to pay, if this bill shall be passed, between eighteen and twenty million dollars, which is three times as great as the deficit in the postal revenues on account of the Parcel Post Service.

So we are confronted with this situation: According to the testimony that has been adduced, it is doubtful whether that class of mail which the Government is now carrying profitably at a loss of \$74,000,000 will under this bill as now written contribute a single, solitary cent toward the payment of the increased salaries of postal employees, while the patrons of the Parcel Post Service, who are generally poor people, who are, generally speaking, the common people of the country, will have to pay three times as much as the deficit estimated to result from that service under the present law.

Mr. MOSES rose.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator from New Hampshire wishes to interrupt me, I yield to him.

Mr. MOSES. I wish to ask the Senator how he voted yesterday on the various proposals to reduce the rates?

Mr. SIMMONS. I voted to reduce the rates; I am in favor of the postal rates staying exactly where they are to-day so far as this bill is concerned. If a proper bill is presented and it is shown any of these rates are too low, I will vote to increase them. But I am opposed, Mr. President, to taxing one class of the people of this country for the service that they receive from a department of the Government for the purpose of paying increased salaries of the employees in that department. I insist that if we are not paying the employees in any department of the Government a sufficient salary the remedy for that is not to impose a tax upon the people who are the beneficiaries of that service, but it is the clear duty of the Government to pay those increased salaries in that department, as it pays increased salaries in any other department and in every other department of the Government, out of the general funds of the Treasury.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that it is the theory of those who are in charge of the bill that this is not a tax bill, but a bill providing a charge for a service.

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, I know that. We thrashed that out a day or so ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. The charge that would pay for the service of parcel post would be well taken care of by an additional \$7,000,000; but, according to the Senator from New Hampshire, he is putting on a tax of an additional \$13,000,000 over and above what it costs for the charge. It is a tax bill and not a service bill at all.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is exactly the point I have been making. I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee, because, while it does not do full justice, it mitigates the wrong which this bill will inflict upon the users of the parcel post.

Mr. President, I rose simply for the purpose of trying to see if there was not some way by which we could get, before we vote, some definite and reliable information as to how much each one of the increases proposed in the bill as amended will yield, so that we may see whether there is equality in the allocation and distribution of these increases. All that is made certain here now is that one service is going to pay three times as much as the deficit in that service, while another service which is a bigger service, probably is going to pay less, and not only less, but it is going to pay practically nothing to offset the big deficit in that branch of the service. According to one estimate, it will pay only \$3,000,000 out of a deficit of \$74,000,000. According to another estimate, instead of paying more than under the present law that branch will pay less, and the deficit instead of being less will be more than now.

With those examples before us, I think it behooves us before we vote upon this matter to ask the committee to furnish the Senate, according to the usual custom in such matters, some definite, reliable, official information, and not the mere statement of the committee or some of its members.

Whenever I was managing a revenue bill or a tariff bill while I was chairman of the Finance Committee, I never asked the Senate to accept my estimate with regard to those matters, or to accept the committee's estimate with regard to them. I realized then, as I do now, that the Treasury Department is the depository of the data, and that in it are the experts that are trained in making estimates of that sort; and I suppose the same thing is true in the Post Office Department. The data upon which estimates can be made are there. The Post Office Department necessarily, dealing as it does with these large matters, must have a corps of experts able to estimate the amount likely to be realized from the imposition of a tax; and we are entitled to an estimate from that department—not only a general blanket estimate, but we are entitled to a

specific estimate, so before we take final action we may know what the result any emendation will make upon the amount of revenue expected to be realized therefrom.

So far as I am concerned, I am not willing in a matter of this sort to take the statement of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses], as much as I esteem him. I think he is ordinarily accurate in reference to matters that are within his knowledge, but this is outside and beyond the scope of the knowledge and experience of the Senator. In order to aid us and guide us in legislating with reference to a matter of such vital importance to the people of this country and to the Nation we need information of a verified character, carrying with it such weight as to accuracy as to insure its reliability. We are entitled to have that information come from the original sources of information, and from men who, by reason of their training and their experience in these matters, are able to make a fair and reasonably accurate estimate.

To legislate, Mr. President, in the state of uncertainty disclosed by the admissions made upon this floor with reference to this whole matter is dangerous. Right upon the threshold of our discussion of the matter in this body the chairman of the subcommittee admitted upon the floor of the Senate that the committee's investigations had been superficial; that they were not satisfactory. He admitted that the subcommittee had thrown overboard the estimates of the cost-ascertainment commission, a commission composed of experts, supposedly, and created for the distinct purpose of investigating this matter. Their report and their findings were summarily thrown overboard, and for these findings were substituted the impressions—and they amount to nothing more than the impressions—of members of the committee or its subcommittee.

Those were the first two things that threw doubt upon the statements or so-called estimates of the Senators in charge of the bill and made the basis upon which we are about to legislate so uncertain and nebulous. Moreover, Mr. President, this uncertainty is apparent in the very language of the bill, in the section of the bill which provides that it shall be of temporary duration, that it shall expire in February of next year, that it shall live only one year at best. This manifest confession of uncertainty and doubt as to its justice of these increased charges against the users of the mails is accentuated by the section of the bill providing for a commission to begin investigations into postal rates immediately after this session of Congress adjourns, and make its report with appropriate recommendations to the next session of Congress with the view of advising as to whether the rates now about to be actually imposed are just and fair and should be made permanent. In other words, we are asked to pass a temporary bill and have it go into effect, however wrongful it may be; however unjust and oppressive to certain interests it may be; and while it is in effect we provide for an official investigation to ascertain and decide whether it is a just and wise legislation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. There is no particular uncertainty about the expenditure, the cost which will be incurred under the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; not the expenditure of the amount that will be realized from the rates.

Mr. BORAH. That is what the bill is for.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what the bill is for, but we do not know whether it will raise too much or too little. But the main thing is, if the Senator will pardon me, that we do not know now whether or not the bill allocates these increases to overcome the alleged deficits in the four branches of the Postal Service in a just and fair way. We do know that as to the parcel post it allocates them so as to require that service to pay three times as much as the Government now loses. We know that.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as the situation presents itself to me, it looks as if there had been imposed upon this committee an almost impossible task. At the last session we passed a bill providing for the increase of salaries of the postal employees, and it became largely a political proposition. Therefore when we came back here we were called upon out of the political exigency which seemed to exist to pay these men, and we were called on also to raise the funds with which to pay them. The committee was required to go to work and in a few weeks deal with one of the most complex and complicated subjects possible and bring out a bill here which in a measure would get by the situation in which we found ourselves. I think that in all probability the committee has done as well as it could have done under the circumstances, but it is just one of those things in which we are legislating concerning a very difficult matter under the political lash.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, Mr. President. I want to say to the Senator from Idaho that one of the first things they seem to have done was to scrap most of the data furnished them by the cost-ascertainment commission and act upon their own judgment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] to the committee amendment.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Ernst	Keyes	Reed, Pa.
Bayard	Fernald	King	Sheppard
Bingham	Ferris	McCormick	Shields
Borah	Fess	McKellar	Shipstead
Brookhart	Fletcher	McKinley	Simmons
Broussard	Frazier	McLean	Smoot
Bruce	Gerry	McNary	Spencer
Bursum	Glass	Mayfield	Stanfield
Butler	Gooding	Means	Stanley
Cameron	Hale	Metcalf	Sterling
Capper	Harrell	Moses	Swanson
Caraway	Harris	Neely	Trammell
Copeland	Harrison	Norbeck	Underwood
Couzens	Heflin	Norris	Wadsworth
Cummins	Howell	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Warren
Dale	Johnson, Minn.	Pepper	Watson
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Wheeler
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Ralston	Willis
Edge	Kendrick	Reed, Mo.	

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment to the amendment of the committee.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Before the vote is taken, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee, the maker of the pending motion, some questions. They may have been answered during the debate, but I think all Senators now present have not heard the debate and do not possess the information sought by these questions.

First, I should like to know the present annual deficit sustained by the Government by reason of its engagement in the parcel-post business.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a trifle less than \$7,000,000 per year.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Next, I should like to know the estimated increase in revenue to the Government if the rate provisions of the pending bill are enacted into law?

Mr. McKELLAR. From eighteen to twenty million dollars upon parcel post.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. What will be the estimated increase in income to the Government from the amendment modifying the parcel-post rates now in the bill and offered by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. From nine to ten million dollars, so that the parcel post will bring in more than the cost of carrying it if my amendment shall be adopted.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In other words, it is agreed by all estimates that if the Senator's amendment is adopted there will be \$2,000,000 more revenue from the parcel post than is necessary to meet the cost to the Government of its parcel-post business.

Mr. McKELLAR. At least \$2,000,000 more.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I shall refuse to vote for higher rates upon parcel-post postal business than are necessary to meet the present deficit to the Government in this branch of the postal business. Therefore I shall vote for the lower rate named in the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as on the previous vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the senior Senator from

South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent. If present, they would vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague [Mr. GEORGE] is absent on business of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—40

Brookhart	Gerry	Kendrick	Shields
Broussard	Glass	McKellar	Shipstead
Bruce	Gooding	Mayfield	Simmons
Caraway	Harris	Neely	Stanfield
Copeland	Harrison	Norbeck	Stanley
Couzens	Heflin	Norris	Swanson
Dial	Howell	Overman	Trammell
Ferris	Johnson, Calif.	Ralston	Underwood
Fletcher	Johnson, Minn.	Reed, Mo.	Walsh, Mass.
Frazier	Jones, N. Mex.	Sheppard	Wheeler

NAYS—39

Ball	Dill	McCormick	Reed, Pa.
Bayard	Edge	McKinley	Shortridge
Bingham	Ernst	McLean	Smoot
Borah	Fernald	McNary	Spencer
Bursum	Fess	Means	Sterling
Butler	Hale	Metcalf	Wadsworth
Cameron	Harrell	Moses	Warren
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Oddie	Watson
Curtis	Keyes	Pepper	Willis
Dale	King	Phipps	

NOT VOTING—17

Ashurst	Greene	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Capper	Ladd	Ransdell	Weller
Edwards	La Follette	Robinson	
Elkins	Lenroot	Smith	
George	Owen	Stephens	

So Mr. McKELLAR's amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSES. I wish to give notice that I shall ask for a separate vote on this amendment in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the committee amendment as amended be agreed to?

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. In section 209, on page 47, the Senator from North Dakota proposes to strike out all of lines 19, 20, 21, and 22, and in line 18 to strike out "\$2.50" and insert "\$10."

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, this would make the provision of the bill as to money orders read:

For orders not exceeding \$10, 5 cents.

This would undoubtedly mean quite an increase in the revenue from the sale of money orders over what the present rate would bring. Under the present system the rate on money orders not exceeding \$2.50 is 3 cents; on money orders not exceeding \$5, 5 cents, and so on. But in third and fourth class post offices the postmasters are allowed 3 cents for each money order they issue, that being a part of their salaries. Under that system, of course, there is no revenue to the Government in the third and fourth class post offices from the sale of money orders costing 3 cents. This would provide a rate of 5 cents for all money orders up to \$10.

It seems to me that as it stands the bill would drive the buyers of money orders away from the post offices and would influence people to go to the banks and buy bank drafts, thereby decreasing the revenue from the sale of money orders.

It is another case where the farmers, especially the people living in the rural districts, will have an additional burden placed upon them by an increase in the cost of money orders, especially in the lower amounts. It is the farmers who send the bulk of the money orders in the lesser amounts, under \$10, I believe. It seems to me it will be only fair to have a minimum charge of 5 cents for any amount up to \$10.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota would bring the rates on money orders down much lower than they are at the present time, and that, too, in a bill by which we propose to increase somewhat the revenue. Under the present law and regulations, on money orders not exceeding \$2.50, the rate is 3 cents. On money orders exceeding \$2.50 and not exceeding \$5, the rate is 5 cents; and the bill proposes an increase to 7 cents. On money orders exceeding \$5, but not exceeding \$10, the present rate is 8 cents, and the proposed rate is 10 cents, and so on in proportion throughout the money orders up to the sum of \$100.

In the interest of the success of the bill I hope that the amendment will not prevail. It is estimated by the Post Office Department that something over \$13,000,000 will be realized

out of the charges for money orders, out of collect on delivery charges, out of registered mail, and so forth, by some increase in rates. The bill does not increase these rates over the estimate of the Post Office Department, leaving them exactly the same as estimated by that department for the purpose of raising the necessary amount with which to pay the increased salaries of the employees.

I do not think that the rates are excessive at all, and I do not believe they will bear hard upon the particular class to which the Senator from North Dakota refers. I think on investigation it will be found that most of the money orders in the smaller amounts even are purchased by the larger enterprises, and comparatively few of them, rather than by farmers and individuals scattered throughout the country. I hope the rates will be allowed to stand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to serve notice that when the bill is in the Senate I shall move to strike out subsection (b) of section 208 on page 44.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. Add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 217(b). The Postmaster General shall be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to provide an additional form and series of postage stamps to be known as franking stamps, which shall hereafter be affixed to all official and other mail now entitled to the franking privilege, and in the same amount or amounts as in the case of mail matter not entitled to free delivery. Such stamps shall be delivered, upon proper receipt therefor, to officials and others entitled to the franking privilege, without charge.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, it is important that Congress and the Government should know exactly what are the expenses of the franking privilege in order that there may be economy in its use. By taking such a course the various departments will economize as far as possible in the use of the stamps. This was found to be true in the case of the District of Columbia, which prior to 1907, I believe, was entitled to the franking privilege. That privilege was then rescinded and the result has been that the mail sent out by the District of Columbia as official has much decreased.

This is a public utility, and if everybody pays what is proper and right no one will pay too much. The Government should contribute for the service rendered to the Government just the same as any other interest. At the present time we have no positive means of knowing what is the cost of the carrying of the mails due to the franking privilege. If we had the information it would enable the Government to recognize its liability, and, as I have pointed out, would result in economy in the use of the franking privilege. Therefore it seems to me that it is important, if we want to conduct the post office as a business enterprise—and we should look upon it in that light only—that we should know what the transactions are in detail, and this is one method that will make clear the cost of certain privileges that are of importance so far as the cost of carrying the mail is concerned.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, the question of the franking stamp is one that has often been before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. It has been discussed at length and in detail and the committee has never thought it expedient to institute that service in the Post Office Department. The whole question of penalty and franked mail, however, does present a very grave problem in the Postal Service and one to which attention should be given. Necessarily it is one of the problems which the special subcommittee of investigation must take up and upon which that committee must reach some conclusion.

The feeling in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads when the matter has been under discussion has been that a preferable method of dealing with the question is to establish some system of bookkeeping entries whereby the Post Office Department should be able to receive proper credit for the service which is rendered to various other executive departments of the Government. In principle I can enter no serious objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska, but in view of the fact that the whole question will be taken up, and very soon, by the special joint subcommittee which is to be created under the terms of the bill, I hope the amendment will be disagreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still in Committee of the Whole and open to further amendment. If no further amendment is proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two amendments are to receive a separate vote in the Senate, one reservation made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] and the other the amendment which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] proposed to amend.

Mr. MOSES. I withdraw my request for a separate vote on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi gave notice that he would renew his amendment in the Senate. Without objection, all the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole with the exception of the amendment which the Senator from Tennessee proposes to amend, will be concurred in in the Senate. The question now is upon agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. Strike out the first paragraph of subsection (b) of section 208 as amended, reading as follows:

(b) That on fourth-class matter the rate of postage shall be by the pound as established by, and in conformity with, the act of August 24, 1912, and in addition thereto there shall be a service charge of 2 cents for each parcel, except upon parcels or packages collected on rural-delivery routes, to be prepaid by postage stamps affixed thereto, or as otherwise prescribed by the regulations of the Postmaster General.

And insert in lieu thereof:

(b) That on fourth-class matter the rate of postage shall be by the pound, the postage in all cases to be prepaid by postage stamps affixed thereto or as otherwise prescribed by regulations of the Postmaster General.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Hampshire expect to get a final vote on the bill to-day?

Mr. MOSES. It all depends on how talkative Senators are on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. HARRISON. I was just wondering if the Senator would not allow the bill to go over under an agreement that we should vote at a certain time to-morrow?

Mr. MOSES. We are so near a final vote on the bill that I think we had better go on and dispose of it.

Mr. HARRISON. The reason why I make the suggestion is that the vote has been very close on the proposition. There was a difference of only 3 votes on my amendment, and there are several Senators who are absent who probably will be here to-morrow. It is a very important matter, and I hope the Senator will let it go over.

Mr. MOSES. No; I can not do so. Even if the bill is further mutilated I can not agree to that course. I think we should have a vote.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to occupy the Senate only for a short time. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], in a speech while the bill was in Committee of the Whole, said that we had reached the "political, filibustering, and silly stage." I do not know what prompted the Senator from New Hampshire to say that. There has been no politics in this matter that I have seen. I am sure no one else except the Senator from New Hampshire has. I had been in hopes that I could vote for the bill. I shall not vote for it, however, if the \$10,000,000 revenue is provided for as it is now proposed to be raised from the parcel post. To say that it is silly is merely because some of us propose to try to keep the burden from being placed on the farmers and to have it placed somewhere else. If that is the Senator's idea, all right! I am glad to know the Senator's definition of it. I am glad I can be classed among the silly ones of the Senate.

There has been no filibustering about it, and there will not be any. Senators on this side of the aisle have cooperated with Senators on the other side of the aisle in trying to expedite public business and pass the general supply bills. We have delayed in no respect, but, on the contrary, have cooperated with you even with this legislative monstrosity that nobody believes in. There is no Senator here who believes that it will ever become a law.

It is commonly rumored that as soon as the bill shall have passed the Senate and reached the House of Representatives one of the influential Members of that body will move that it be rejected, and will then introduce a similar bill in the House, at the same time calling attention to the fact that the Senate has passed an unconstitutional measure. That fact has come to the attention of Senators on the other side; it has been published in the press. The House would be acting very properly if it should take that course. Its Members would be raising themselves in the estimation of the people by refusing to put through a proposition like this, which shows upon the part of the Senators who are trying to foist it on the country a lack of courage.

Senators are talking here of raising \$68,000,000 in revenue, but although there is a deficit of \$74,000,000 created by the handling of second-class mail matter those who favor the pending measure refuse to provide for reducing any of that deficit from the second-class mail matter. On the contrary, the proposal is to reduce rates for second-class mail matter still further to the extent of \$640,000. Of course, the Senator from New Hampshire says that that is not true, that the provisions of the bill would increase revenue derived from second-class mail matter by \$3,000,000; but I answered him by producing and having read, as it was read, a letter from the Postmaster General of his own party, which states that there will be a further deficit created of \$640,000.

If Senators on the other side of the Chamber wish to admit that their own department is so inefficient that they would rather believe the Senator from New Hampshire than to believe the head of the Post Office Department, then, well and good, but their own Postmaster General makes the statement which I have just quoted.

I have great respect not only for the ability and integrity of the Postmaster General but I also have great respect for the character and ability of the men under him and who are furnishing the facts on which he writes this letter. That is what the Senator's own Postmaster General has stated in this letter, which was written as late as noon to-day; that this proposed legislation will reduce the rates on second-class mail matter, namely, the great newspapers and periodicals of the country, to the extent of \$640,000. According to the report, there is a deficit of \$74,000,000 from second-class mail matter alone, and yet when that might be the source from which some of this revenue could be raised, the proponents of this measure refuse to do it. Whether or not there is justification for that law, can there be any justification for further increasing the deficit on second-class matter?

The Sterling bill originally proposed an increase, but as soon as the representatives of the newspapers came here and said, "Soft pedal," what did Senators who favor the bill do? They turned a somersault backward in order to get away from it just as quickly as they could. Now more favorable rates are proposed, and the amount they have to pay is to be reduced \$640,000, to be added to the \$74,000,000 deficit which is carried in the bill.

Then the framers of this measure go to the fourth-class mail matter and say to the farmers of the country, who strove for years to get the Parcel Post System and only obtained it after a long struggle, "You have got to pay out of the \$50,000,000 that we are going to raise \$20,000,000."

Oh, the Senator from New Hampshire shakes his head at me.

Mr. MOSES. O Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. As shown from the Record on yesterday, in answer to a question which I propounded to him, "How much do you expect to raise from the 2 cents which is imposed on parcel post," he said, "There are a billion packages which go through the parcel post, and if each of them carries a charge of 2 cents, the amount raised will be about \$20,000,000." That was the Senator's answer.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MOSES. The Senate has just adopted an amendment cutting that squarely in two.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; over the protest and objection of the Senator who is leading in this fight and over the objection of many other Senators the amount has been reduced \$10,000,000, but as the bill is now constituted it is proposed to raise \$10,000,000 from the source. So what is the present situation? When we originally passed the postal salary increase bill it involved an expenditure of \$68,000,000, and the President vetoed the bill. In his message he said, "I will not stand for it; I will not consent to this increase unless you raise the revenue with which to pay it." The Senator from New Hampshire admitted that the bill would only raise \$50,000,000. That was

on yesterday. The bill has been cut \$10,000,000 more, so there now remains only \$40,000,000 of revenue in the bill. There will be \$68,000,000 required. There is a difference now of \$28,000,000. How can Senators on the other side of the Chamber expect their President, if he lives up to his word in his veto message, to sign the bill?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. EDGE. How did the Senator from Mississippi vote on the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] still further to reduce the rates?

Mr. HARRISON. I am delighted that the Senator has asked me that question. Unfortunately for me, I was not here when the vote was taken. I was in favor of that provision, however, and I am going to discuss it in a moment. That was the little sugar-coated pill that the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from New Hampshire would give to the farmers of the country. What was it?

Mr. Stewart, representing the Post Office Department, stated that of the billion packages which enter into the parcel-post service but 1½ per cent originate on the rural routes of the country, in other words, 1½ per cent of all the packages that enter the parcel post come from the farmers. Those will be excluded from this charge. Were the packages that go to the farmers on the rural routes excluded from the operation of this 2-cent burden or 1-cent burden, as it is now fixed in the bill, or were the parcel-post packages that go to the little third and fourth class post offices of the country so excluded?

The Senator from Minnesota knows that the farmers in his State get their parcel-post packages nine times out of ten in the little third or fourth class post offices and not out on the rural routes. There is not a Senator here who represents an agricultural community but knows that when he sends the farmer down in his State a package he addresses it to the post office in the little town and not out on the rural routes. Many of us refuse to send packages to the rural routes for the reason that we want to save some cost in the addressing of the envelopes, and many of us—I would say all of us—do so because we know when we send it to a little town having a third class or fourth class post office that the farmer living on a rural route near by will get it.

So Mr. Stewart, representing the Post Office Department, has stated that 35 per cent of all the parcel-post packages go into the third and fourth class post offices of the country. Those are the people who are affected; those are the ones upon whom it is attempted to place the \$20,000,000, but which a majority of the Senate has reduced to \$10,000,000.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator from Mississippi has made an impassioned defense of the George amendment, but it is not the George amendment to which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] referred. The Senator from New Jersey was referring to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], which still further reduced the rates to be paid on second-class mail matter.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not recall that amendment; I am not familiar with that proposition, I am sorry to say.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator was not present and did not vote for it, so his skirts are clear in the matter. I assume that had he been present he would have voted for that as well as the other amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not know what it was, and so I can not discuss the proposition. If the amendment is what I now gather it to be, I should have supported it.

Mr. MOSES. I have just told the Senator what it was, and the great majority of the Senators on his side of the Chamber voted for it.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, I presume they did so conscientiously, and I assume that those on the other side who voted for it did the same thing.

Mr. MOSES. Does the Senator mean that those who voted against it did not do so conscientiously?

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, they voted conscientiously. I never ascribe bad motives to Senators. If I should do so, I would pick the Senator from New Hampshire out and say he is playing peanut politics in bringing this bill in here now, when he knows it will never become a law. [Laughter.] However, I will not do that, for I hold the Senator in too high regard to place him in any such attitude as that.

Mr. President, I look into the faces of Senators around me; and while I do not want to bring any politics into the discussion, I wish to say that, in my opinion, the farmer to-day has about reached the lowest ebb, so far as being organized is

concerned, or having anyone to represent him here before the Congress of the United States.

I see representatives of every other business interest here, but I have not seen a representative of a farmers' organization around the Capitol who has said anything about this bill, nor have I had any letters from any farmers in the country protesting against the outrageous inequality of imposing a burden of \$20,000,000 upon them and destroying the Parcel Post System. The farmers of the country had better get busy or they will gradually have taken from them whatever rights they still have left.

If Senators want to grant increased pay to the postal employees, well and good; I am for it; I have been for giving them an increase of salary. I care nothing about the theory of making the Post Office Department pay as it goes. I can not see any justice in the contention that that department has got to do that, when all the other departments of the Government pay nothing as they run.

I think the postal employees are entitled to an increase in their wages. I have voted, as I say, for the bill increasing their salaries every time it has come before the Senate. I voted to override the President's veto. Yet the Senator from New Hampshire says that we have reached the silly stage here. He voted to override the President's veto, but his colleague on the committee who is helping to force this measure through the Senate, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STELLING], voted to sustain the President's veto. If we had had about one more vote we would have given the postal employees their increased salaries.

Was the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], who, it is said, wrote the provision imposing a 2-cent additional charge upon parcel-post packages, a friend of the postal employees? He was one of those who voted to sustain the President's veto; and so most of the Senators who are now championing this measure were not friends of the postal employees' bill when they might have lifted their voices here and given them the increased salary which they need. A little help at that time would have gone a long way.

I was opposed when we tried to give to the soldiers a bonus to raising the revenue by adopting the bill of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] imposing a sales tax. A sales tax! Under such a tax every time one paid the tax he would say "that is going to pay the soldier's bonus." It was wrong in principle; that was one of the reasons I was against it; and I am against giving to the postal employees an increase of salary by saying to the farmer "You have got to pay an additional tax on your parcel-post packages." It is not fair to the postal employees for them to be told any such thing as that. I hope that the \$10,000,000 will be eliminated from this bill.

I appeal to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON], who comes up for reelection next year, not to be placed in such a position that when he goes back to the farmers in his State he will have to say, "I voted to impose a \$10,000,000 additional burden on you in order to give the postal employees of the country an increase in salary." I appeal to my friend from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD], who also comes up for reelection next year, not to put himself in such a position by voting against this proposition that when he goes back to his State he will have to say, "I voted to levy a \$10,000,000 tax upon you farmers of Oregon in order to give the postal employees an increased salary." I appeal to every Senator on the other side of the Chamber and every Senator on this side, who comes up for reelection two years from now as well as four years from now, not to put themselves in the position of imposing \$10,000,000 of taxes on the farmers in order to give a salary increase to the postal employees.

If we are going to raise the revenue, let us raise it from some other source. Senators may think that to vote down my amendment will give strength to the bill, but there are Senators on this side who will not vote for the bill on final passage if the bill proposes to raise this revenue out of the farmers of the country. I want to vote for the bill; I will vote for the bill if there may be eliminated this additional charge on parcel-post packages; but if the proposal to eliminate that charge shall be defeated, I will face the postal employees of the country. I have been their friend; and if they think that they can fall out with me because I refuse to add burdens on the farmers in order to give them increased salaries, then, let them go. I want my action to be prompted by what I conceive to be justice. I know it is not just, I know it is not fair, to impose this \$10,000,000 of taxes on the farmers of the country and at the same time provide the entering wedge which will destroy the Parcel Post System.

Let me repeat that those pushing this bill do not stop there. As I said while the bill was being considered as in Committee of the Whole, the rates on the money orders which the farmers have to buy have been increased. They are the ones who go into the little fourth-class and third-class post offices and buy money orders with which to buy something from Montgomery Ward & Co. or Sears, Roebuck & Co. or some other big mail-order house. The advocates of this measure propose to raise the rate upon them, and they do not stop there. When that man's little package of merchandise starts on its road to the purchaser, they say to the concern from which he bought: "You will have to insure it, but the rate shall be increased in this bill," and consequently the farmer gets it in three different ways. They increase the rate by making him buy this 2-cent stamp and put it on parcel-post packages; they make him pay more through the money-order increase; and they make him pay more for the insurance policy that insures his goods in transit.

The little housewife who lives in the town, whose husband is just eking out a miserable existence, who has been in the habit of buying a dozen eggs from the farmer, calls him up and says to him:

Send me a dozen eggs this morning.

She has to pay 2 cents additional for those eggs.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. The same thing is true with reference to any pound of stuff that they may buy to go upon their breakfast table or their supper table.

I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. We have already adopted a proviso which exempts all packages originating on rural free-delivery routes from the service charge for hauling.

Mr. HARRISON. Then I will eliminate the rural routes. Let us take the star routes. She would have to pay an increase there. Let us eliminate the star route, and say that the little woman lives on the outskirts of a town and asks the merchant in the town to send out, through parcel post, this package. She would have to pay an increase then. Instead of paying the 5-cent rate on her pound of food she would have to pay 7 cents—an increase of 40 per cent in that transaction.

Senators, if you want to do that, go ahead; go your way; but every Senator who votes against this amendment that seeks to put the parcel-post rates on the same basis as they are to-day will have to answer to his constituents when he comes up for reelection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HARRISON. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am not in sympathy with the procedure forced upon us here, which requires the raising of certain revenue before we can grant to the postal employees the increase in salary to which they are justly entitled. My point is that the postal employees should be treated with the same consideration that other Government employees receive—that when their efficient service and increased duties entitle them to more pay it ought to be paid to them as a matter of right, without requiring them and their friends to devise some scheme of taxation in order to provide the funds necessary to grant the increase to which they are entitled.

Mr. President, I recall that just a few days ago Congress appropriated several millions of dollars to turn over to Mr. Mellon to enable him to refund taxes that had been paid in to the Government, but that Mr. Mellon had seen fit to order returned to certain big taxpayers. In many instances I think those refunds are being made where they ought not to be made, but you have not complained about that. If he decides to return the tax he does so, and Congress has appropriated millions upon millions for Mr. Mellon to use for that purpose, and not once has a single Republican lifted his voice and proposed that before that money should be refunded taxes should be raised in a certain way, or in any way, to supply the amount refunded. When it comes to raising the salaries of the postal employees, why do you require in this particular case that somebody who uses the mails shall be taxed in order that they may have the increase to which their service entitles them?

I desire to enter my protest now, so that the record of these proceedings will show that quite a number of Senators here do not wish that this method of procedure shall by common consent become a precedent to rise up in the future to haunt postal employees when they ask for deserved increases at the hands of Congress.

Mr. President, I am going to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, as I did vote a little while ago. I do not want to see the Parcel Post System handicapped or destroyed. I am for the increase in salaries asked for by the postal employees. I voted for the bill which passed Congress last year, and when the President vetoed that bill I voted to pass it over his veto. I am anxious for the postal employees to have that increase at the earliest day possible, but I have not been able to agree that those who are pressing this measure here now are entirely sincere in their efforts to really bring about an increase in the salaries of the postal employees. It is true that this bill has been improved by amendments, but I would much prefer to vote for a bill which did the fair and square thing by the postal employees, as the bill did which we tried to pass over the President's veto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HEFLIN. The yeas and nays were asked for on the amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays are demanded. Is the demand seconded?

Mr. MOSES. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Fernald	Keyes	Sheppard
Bayard	Ferris	King	Shields
Bingham	Fess	McCormick	Shipstead
Borah	Fletcher	McKellar	Shortridge
Brookhart	Frazier	McKinley	Simmons
Broussard	George	McLean	Smoot
Bruce	Gerry	McNary	Spencer
Bursum	Glass	Mayfield	Stanfield
Butler	Gooding	Means	Sterling
Cameron	Hale	Metcalf	Swanson
Capper	Harrell	Moses	Trammell
Caraway	Harris	Neely	Underwood
Copeland	Harrison	Norbeck	Wadsworth
Couzens	Hefflin	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Cummings	Howell	Oddie	Warren
Dale	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Watson
Dial	Johnson, Minn.	Pepper	Weller
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Wheeler
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Mo.	Willis
Ernst	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. Is the demand for the yeas and nays seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask that my amendment be read again before we vote on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment upon which we are about to vote.

The READING CLERK. The amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi is to strike out the first paragraph of subdivision (b), section 208, as amended, and insert in lieu thereof:

(b) That on fourth-class matter the rate of postage shall be by the pound, the postage in all cases to be prepaid by postage stamps affixed thereto, or as otherwise prescribed by regulations of the Postmaster General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WATSON (when Mr. CURTIS's name was called). The senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with my colleague, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. RALSTON], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. STERLING. Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the last vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. FRAZIER. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. LADD] would vote "yea" if he were present.

Mr. ERNST (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], and I am advised that he has not voted. I therefore withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—34

Brookhart	Gerry	McKellar	Shipstead
Broussard	Glass	Mayfield	Simmons
Bruce	Gooding	Neely	Swanson
Caraway	Harris	Norbeck	Trammell
Copeland	Harrison	Norris	Underwood
Dial	Hefflin	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Johnson, Calif.	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Frazier	Johnson, Minn.	Sheppard	
George	Jones, N. Mex.	Shields	

NAYS—41

Ball	Fernald	McKinley	Smoot
Bayard	Ferris	McLean	Spencer
Bingham	Fess	McNary	Stanfield
Bursum	Hale	Means	Sterling
Butler	Harrell	Metcalf	Wadsworth
Cameron	Howell	Moses	Warren
Couzens	Jones, Wash.	Oddie	Watson
Cummings	Kendrick	Pepper	Willis
Dale	Keyes	Phipps	
Dill	King	Reed, Pa.	
Edge	McCormick	Shortridge	

NOT VOTING—21

Ashurst	Ernst	Pittman	Stephens
Borah	Greene	Ralston	Walsh, Mont.
Capper	Ladd	Ransdell	Weller
Curtis	La Follette	Robinson	
Edwards	Lenroot	Smith	
Elkins	Owen	Stanley	

So Mr. HARRISON's amendment to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole was rejected.

The amendment made as in Committee of the Whole was concurred in.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the clerks at the desk inform me that an error has crept into the proceedings. It will be recalled that when I offered the amendment a while ago to change the numeral "2" to "1," and the word "cents" to "cent" in the parcel post amendment, the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole had not been concurred in, so that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] could offer an amendment to it. After his amendment failed, then I offered the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole. Now the clerk tells me that when the amendment was voted on afterwards, as a matter of course it did not read "1 cent," but read "2 cents." I ask unanimous consent that that error be corrected, and that the language "1 cent" be inserted in the bill in place of "2 cents."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the correction will be made. The bill is in the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is, Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time?

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MOSES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRUCE (when his name was called). I am paired on this question with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. RALSTON], who is absent. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea," and I would vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Washington (when Mr. LENROOT's name was called). The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is absent on account of illness in his family. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). On this vote I understand that my pair, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], would vote the same way I intend to vote, and I therefore am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DALE. My colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], is unavoidably detained. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. FRAZIER. My colleague, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON. The senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is absent from the Chamber on account of illness. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. If the Senator from Kansas were present, he would vote "yea" on the passage of this measure.

Mr. WHEELER. My colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] is unavoidably absent from the Senate. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr.

ASHURST], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], if present, would each vote "yea."

Mr. ERNST. Has my colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. ERNST. I desire to transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] and vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 8, as follows:

YEAS—70

Ball	Ferris	King	Shields
Bayard	Fess	McCormick	Shipstead
Bingham	Fletcher	McKellar	Shortridge
Broussard	Frazier	McKinley	Simmons
Bursum	George	McLean	Smoot
Butler	Gerry	McNary	Spencer
Cameron	Gooding	Mayfield	Stanfield
Capper	Hale	Means	Sterling
Caraway	Harrell	Metcalf	Trammell
Copeland	Harris	Moses	Wadsworth
Couzens	Heflin	Neely	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Howell	Oddie	Warren
Dale	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Watson
Dial	Johnson, Minn.	Pepper	Weller
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Wheeler
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Mo.	Willis
Ernst	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	
Fernald	Keyes	Sheppard	

NAYS—8

Borah	Glass	Norbeck	Swanson
Brookhart	Harrison	Norris	Underwood

NOT VOTING—18

Ashurst	Greene	Pittman	Stanley
Bruce	Ladd	Ralston	Stephens
Curtis	La Follette	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Edwards	Lenroot	Robinson	
Elkins	Owen	Smith	

So the bill was passed.

CAPE COD CANAL

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I had intended to ask unanimous consent to take from the calendar the bill (H. R. 3933) for the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal property, and for other purposes, but there are several Senators interested in the bill who are absent. I wish to announce that on Wednesday next, at the close of the morning hour, I shall ask unanimous consent to have the bill considered.

THE ISLE OF PINES TREATY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on Monday at the first opportunity I shall request that the Senate go into open executive session for the consideration of the Isle of Pines treaty in order that I may address a few remarks to the Senate upon that subject.

REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3445) to provide for the reorganization and more effective coordination of the executive branch of the Government, to create the department of education and relief, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING. Does my colleague intend to continue the discussion of the bill this afternoon if it is taken up?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that if we take it up and it thus becomes the unfinished business I shall then move to proceed to the consideration of executive business. I also wish to state that unless there is some objection on the part of the Senate, to-morrow will be devoted to the consideration of bills on the calendar. I wish to state further that I shall move that the Senate adjourn after the executive session this afternoon.

Mr. KING. I ask my colleague whether there were hearings on the bill which he is seeking to have made the unfinished business and whether the hearings have been published?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; there were hearings, which have been printed, and there is quite a volume of them.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I observe that the special order on Senate bill 33 is to begin on Monday at 2 o'clock. The Senator from Utah is requesting to make the reorganization bill the unfinished business. Then on Wednesday we are to have the Cape Cod Canal bill. I would like to ask those who are in charge of the program for the next 29 days in which we have to work, what particular place in that program the carrying out of the recommendations of the President and the special commission with reference to agriculture is going to have?

Mr. SMOOT. So far as I am concerned, I can not answer the Senator. I can not state what course the legislation will take.

Mr. BORAH. I notice that the majority leader is absent.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; he is not well to-day.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator from Utah does not know anything about it, does the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] know?

Mr. WATSON. I do not know; but I can conjecture. I think that the measure proposed by the Senator from Utah, as I understand it, is not to displace the special order on Monday. Am I right about that?

Mr. SMOOT. As far as I am concerned, I shall ask the Senate to temporarily lay aside the unfinished business whenever it is desired to have the Isle of Pines treaty come before the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. I am not concerned about the Isle of Pines. Any time is soon enough to give away territory. I am concerned about whether there is to be any place in the program to carry out the recommendations which have been made by the fact finding commission with reference to agriculture.

Mr. WATSON. My understanding is that that is to be done, I will say to the Senator from Idaho, though, so far as I am informed, a definite time has not yet been fixed.

Mr. SMOOT. So far as I am concerned I will assist in bringing that legislation before the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. I ask the Senators to bear in mind that we have, I think, but 29 more working days.

Mr. WATSON. But we have a good many nights.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; but we do not work at night very much. We have 29 working days including the nights. By the time we get through with the Cape Cod Canal bill and the special order, and the bill which the Senator from Utah is endeavoring to have made the unfinished business, there will be much less than 29 days. There will have to be an understanding that the other program is not to be interfered with or else we will not do anything at all upon the subject. I give notice now that if those who have charge of the program do not upon Monday provide for a program in regard to the matter, I shall undertake to do it myself.

Mr. MOSES. Through a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. I ask the Senator from Utah whether he is requesting unanimous consent to take up the bill or whether he is moving that it be taken up?

Mr. SMOOT. I have moved to take it up.

Mr. GLASS. I was going to suggest if the Senator was asking unanimous consent that I propose to object. I imagine that the Senator knows he can not hope to enact the legislation at this session of Congress and it seems to me to take it up is to waste the time of the Senate when other matters might be taken up that could be consummated.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is in hope of passing the bill at this session of Congress.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. I appreciate what has been said by the Senator from Idaho in regard to other important legislation. In addition to that which he has mentioned I could mention several other bills that are important and are waiting the consideration and action of the Senate upon them.

I think, Mr. President, that the very short time we shall have for the remainder of the session might be more profitably used than in the discussion of the bill consideration for which is asked by the Senator from Utah.

I am free to say, Mr. President, that I am opposed to the bill and that I am opposed to the pending motion. I shall not delay action upon the motion at all by calling for a record vote upon it or anything of that kind, but I simply wish to emphasize the fact that there is all this important business waiting to be considered and that we may well use to better advantage in the consideration of that business the long time which I think will be required in the consideration of the bill which the Senator from Utah proposes shall now be taken up.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to advise the Senator from South Dakota, whose objection to the bill is in relation to the establishment of a department of education, that I have letters from Doctor Fairchild, from the Commissioner of Education, and I have been visited by Miss Williams, who appeared before the committee in favor of the establishment of a department of education alone, who all express the hope that the bill will pass as it now stands.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, however much controverted that provision may prove to be, there are other provisions of the bill

that are very bitterly contested. Within the last two days I have had letters from some of the most eminent physicians in the United States very bitterly objecting to the proposition practically to dismantle and wreck the Public Health Service and put it into the Veterans' Bureau, where we have had interminable difficulties for years and years. So the Senator from Utah may be well assured that if he is going to make this bill the unfinished business of the Senate it is going to consume considerable time that might better be devoted to some measures that we may hope to pass.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, again I wish to say to the Senate that many leading men of the country who are interested in the public health of the Nation are opposed to this measure because of the fact that they have never taken into consideration what the bill proposes to do in relation to the Public Health Service. I have received letters similar to those which have been received by the Senator from Virginia; I have answered those letters and stated just what the bill provides, and then I have received answers that those who had written to me had no objection to the bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Why is consideration asked for this bill right now? What great measure is it?

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly aware that there are some people who do not want any change at all in the present structure of the Government departments.

Mr. OVERMAN. What is the character of the bill for which the Senator from Utah asks consideration? Can he explain it? It proposes to reorganize the entire Government, does it not?

Mr. SMOOT. It proposes a reorganization which should have taken place a great many years ago.

Mr. OVERMAN. But can it not take place as well next year?

Mr. SMOOT. This proposed legislation has been under consideration now during four years.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Are we right in assuming that the Senator does not intend to exclude appropriation bills?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not intended to exclude any appropriation bills whatever.

Mr. WATSON. Or any bill carrying out the President's program?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not expect to do so and do not intend to do so.

Mr. WATSON. Precisely.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator from Indiana that if we amalgamate one or more of the departments, why would not that infringe upon the appropriation bills as a result? In other words, if the appropriations bills have already been passed and one or more departments of the Government are reconstructed, will not the appropriations for those departments have to be made over again?

Mr. SMOOT. No; because of the fact that the bill provides that transfers of the appropriation shall be made.

Mr. BAYARD. Can that be done as a revenue measure in this House?

Mr. SMOOT. The bill is not a revenue measure; there is not a dollar to be raised by the bill. It provides for transferring appropriations which may already have been made to the departments for which they have been provided in case of the transfer of one department to another department; but that has nothing to do with the raising of revenue. That has been done by this body time and time again; in fact, whole departments have been created by bills originating in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senate be in order? The Chair thinks the debate ought to proceed in the regular way. The Senator from Utah has the floor to say whatever he desires to submit to the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for a vote upon the motion, Mr. President.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield the floor?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield the floor.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does the Senator from Utah think the country will go to the bow wows if the reorganization bill shall not be passed?

Mr. SMOOT. No; but a good many activities in some of the departments might, more or less, go to the bow wows.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Utah and to others on both sides of the Chamber

that the bill providing appropriations for Federal aid to roads in the various States is now upon the calendar. It is a very important measure and ought to be passed. I think we ought to take that bill up and pass it, and I ask the Senator from Utah to permit us to do that before he makes any motion with reference to the bill to which he has referred.

Mr. SMOOT. My attention was distracted for the moment. I did not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will say to the Senator from Utah that I hold in my hand a very short bill providing appropriations for Federal aid to roads in the States. I suggest that we pass that bill before the Senator presses the bill in which he is interested.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I have made my motion and I want the Senate to act upon it. There will be plenty of time, so far as that is concerned, for the Senator to bring up the good roads bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. And there will also be plenty of time for the consideration of the bill of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota is present and wishes to ask unanimous consent to consider and pass the good roads bill. That bill simply proposes to carry out existing law. A Senator who had some objection is now willing that the bill shall be considered.

Mr. HEFLIN. It will take but a little while.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from South Dakota, who has charge of the good roads bill, desires to ask unanimous consent to consider that bill. It is, I repeat, a very important one, and I hope the Senator will make his request.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask unanimous consent now to that effect, but there is a motion pending made by the Senator from Utah. When that shall have been disposed of I will make the request.

Mr. SMOOT. When the Senate shall have voted upon the motion I have made, then I will have no objection to the Senator from South Dakota making his request for unanimous consent; in fact, I will ask unanimous consent that the reorganization bill be temporarily laid aside so that other business may be transacted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized to debate this question.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I have nothing further to say in regard to the motion made by the Senator from Utah, except to state that under the reorganization bill there is included in the proposed department of education and relief provided for in that bill these activities of the Government: Education, Public Health Service, Veterans' Bureau, Pension Bureau, and, I think, two or three other services, which I do not now recall. The report made by the joint commission says in terms that the War Veterans' Bureau itself is larger than some of the departments of the Government; and yet it is proposed to put that bureau in with the Department of Education as well as the Public Health Service and the Pension Bureau, all under the name of a department of education and relief.

Mr. OVERMAN. Is it not proposed to put insane institutions in also?

Mr. STERLING. Yes; St. Elizabeths Hospital is to be included.

Mr. OVERMAN. And Howard University?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in answer to what the Senator said, I wish to say it seems to me that the St. Elizabeths Hospital ought to be under a relief head rather than under the Secretary of the Interior, where it is to-day. I can explain all of the transfers; and if any Senator wants to know why any transfer has been made, good reason can be shown for every such transfer.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, after we have passed the bill creating the department of education and relief, after those two elements of human life shall have been taken care of, what else will there be for the Government to do?

Mr. SMOOT. There will always be a necessity for appropriations.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, one of the most important measures pending before the Senate is the House good roads bill, which has been here now for a long time. If the reorganization bill should be taken up by the Senate, during the time when it may remain the unfinished business it will require practically unanimous consent, unless it shall be superseded by some other measure, to secure consideration for the bill making appropriations for good roads. That bill, as I have said, simply carries out existing law.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I do not intend to ask that the reorganization bill shall be considered to-night. I am going to ask unanimous consent, if my motion shall be agreed to by the Senate, temporarily to lay the

bill aside, so that if the Senate wishes to take up the bill referred to by the Senator from Virginia it may do so.

Mr. SWANSON. All I ask is that the Senator from South Dakota shall be granted unanimous consent to have the roads bill considered. There is no objection to it except on the part of two or three. When that bill gets in front of the bill of the Senator from Utah I will feel better satisfied that the reorganization bill will not interfere with the good roads legislation and defeat it at this session of Congress. I can not consent, so far as my vote is concerned, that the bill proposed by the Senator from Utah shall go ahead of the good roads bill.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all right.

Mr. SWANSON. The good roads bill does not change the law at all; it makes no increase in appropriations; it merely carries out authorizations that have been made this year and provides the amount carried by the law for the last four or five years. It involves no increase or decreases.

Mr. BORAH. It is not necessary for the Senator to mention that the bill makes no decreases in appropriations.

Mr. SWANSON. We do not want to decrease appropriations for a project like good roads. I do not see why the Senator from Utah should object to acting on the good roads bill before his bill shall be made the unfinished business. I can not consent that his bill shall be made the unfinished business while this other great measure is pending here.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. STERLING. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate—

Mr. SMOOT. There is no need of the Senator asking unanimous consent at this time, for I want a vote on my motion, and if it shall be agreed to I am going to ask that the bill be laid aside. If the Senator can then secure unanimous consent for the consideration of his bill, very well.

Mr. STERLING. Very well, I withhold the request.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the pending motion is subject to debate, being made after 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. I hope that every Senator who is in favor of good roads and does not want to have the bill making provision for them jeopardized by making as the unfinished business a measure which might interfere with it will see that no bill shall be made the unfinished business until the good roads bill shall have been disposed of in some way.

Mr. SMOOT. It is for the Senate to decide as to that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McNARY. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with my colleague [Mr. RALSTON] to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. STERLING (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, I voted without thinking about my pair. I have since been informed, however, that my pair, if present, would vote the same way that I have voted. Therefore I will let my vote stand.

Mr. BALL (after having voted in the negative). I understand that my pair, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], has not voted and is not present. I have just been informed, however, that if present the Senator from Florida would vote as I have voted, so I will let my vote stand.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS]. He has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—25

Bingham	Harrell	McKinley	Smoot
Bursum	Harrison	McLean	Spencer
Cameron	Johnson, Calif.	McNary	Wadsworth
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Means	Willis
Edge	Kendrick	Pepper	
Fess	Keyes	Phipps	
Hale	McKellar	Reed, Pa.	

NAYS—41

Ball	Bruce	Couzens	Frazier
Bayard	Butler	Dial	George
Borah	Capper	Dill	Gerry
Brookhart	Caraway	Ernst	Glass
Broussard	Copeland	Ferris	Gooding

Harris
Heflin
Howell
Johnson, Minn.
Jones, N. Mex.
King

Metcalf
Moses
Neely
Oddie
Overman
Sheppard

Shipstead
Simmons
Sterling
Swanson
Trammell
Underwood

Walsh, Mass.
Watson
Wheeler

NOT VOTING—30

Ashurst
Curtis
Dale
Edwards
Elkins
Fernald
Fletcher
Greene

Ladd
La Follette
Lenroot
McCormick
Mayfield
Norbeck
Norris
Owen

Pittman
Ralston
Ransdell
Reed, Mo.
Robinson
Shields
Shortridge
Smith

Stanfield
Stanley
Stephens
Walsh, Mont.
Warren
Weller

So Mr. Smoot's motion was rejected.

GOOD ROADS

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 872, House bill 4971, known as the good roads bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, does the Senator plan to go ahead with the bill this afternoon?

Mr. STERLING. I had expected to go ahead with it.

Mr. BORAH. I object.

Mr. STERLING. Then, Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4971, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. BALL. I do not want to discuss the motion. I want the Senator to yield while I have a Senate joint resolution passed.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to have a vote on this motion first.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I want to ask the Senator again if he is going to proceed with the bill this afternoon. If he is, I desire to debate this motion a while, in order that we may have a little time to look into the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. It carries only \$75,000,000; that is all.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator is wrong about that. The bill carries \$75,000,000 a year.

Mr. STERLING. To accommodate the Senator from Idaho, if the bill is made the unfinished business by the Senate, I will ask to have it temporarily laid aside. That will give the Senator from Idaho or any other Senator an opportunity to look into it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this bill involves an expenditure of \$75,000,000 a year.

Mr. STERLING. Yes; just the amount that we appropriated for last year.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. It is a splendid thing to take \$75,000,000 a year out of the Treasury by unanimous consent. We have just tried to secure the consideration of a bill that would save the Government some money, but I observe that efforts of that kind always fail. If, however, the bill takes money out of the Treasury of the United States, it is all right.

Mr. STERLING. This bill is simply in pursuance of a policy of the Government ever since 1916, when the first good roads bill was passed. People have been demanding that an appropriation much greater than \$75,000,000 a year be authorized. They have asked for \$100,000,000; but the House has passed a bill, and it is before us, authorizing the appropriation of \$75,000,000 a year for the next two years for good roads.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4971) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as

amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, with an amendment.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I now ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. SMOOT. I object to laying aside the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President—

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, what was the request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asked unanimous consent that the bill just laid before the Senate be temporarily laid aside. There was objection to that request, so the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, out of order, I report back favorably from the Committee on Finance a bill, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It will not take half a minute.

Mr. HEFLIN. Let it be read.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us see what it is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the title of the bill.

The READING CLERK. From the Committee on Finance the Senator from Pennsylvania reports back favorably, without amendment, House bill 7918, to diminish the number of appraisers at the port of Baltimore, and for other purposes, and he submits a report (No. 947) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT. That bill will save some money.

The PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BRUCE. I object.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Maryland withdraw his objection?

Mr. BRUCE. I will not. It affects Baltimore. I suppose the Senator wants me not to make any objection, but he has not spoken to me about it before.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BALL. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 174, Order of Business 996.

Mr. SMOOT. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 174.

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this joint resolution authorizes—

Mr. SMOOT. It does not make any difference what it authorizes; I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I merely want to call to the attention of the Senate what has just happened.

In May, 1921, the then President of the United States, President Harding, recommended, through a message to Congress, that a joint commission on reorganization of all the Government departments should be appointed and that the question of reorganization should be considered. Since the present President has come in, he has delivered a message to Congress asking for the adoption of the recommendations of this commission. On the motion of the Senator from Utah to take up and consider that bill, which comes within about five or six weeks of the time when this Congress will come to an end, we find some very distinguished administration Senators refusing to comply not only with the request of President Coolidge but with the request of the lamented President Harding.

In looking over the roll call, the motion having had only 25 votes cast for it and 41 votes cast against it, I find that such administration leaders voted against taking up for consideration this administration measure as Senators BALL, BORAH—who has lately become an administration leader—BROOKHART [laughter], BUTLER, the chairman of the Republican National Committee—

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, is the Senator reading those names in classes?

Mr. HARRISON. They may be classified through a policy of Executive elimination later on—CAPPER, COUZENS, ERNST, GOODING, HOWELL, METCALF, MOSES (chairman senatorial campaign committee), ODDIE, STERLING, and WATSON. These are some of the administration Senators who refused to comply with the request of the President to take up the administra-

tion reorganization bill. What do you mean by giving this jolt to the administration?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. WATSON. Will not the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho withhold the motion?

Mr. BORAH. I do. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. I want to plead with the Senator from Utah to withdraw his objection to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 174. It is a joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], authorizing the granting of permits to the committee on inaugural ceremonies, and if it is not passed now it may not be passed at all.

Mr. SMOOT. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets to-morrow it will consider only unobjected bills on the Private Calendar.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. I would like to amend my remarks further by saying that the other administration leader, Mr. SMOOT, objects even to paying out any money for the inauguration of President Coolidge.

Mr. SMOOT. It will come in time. There is plenty of time.

Mr. BORAH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator withhold that request for a moment?

Mr. BORAH. I withhold the request.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator yield to me to renew my request for a unanimous consent?

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. HARRELD. I would like to know what became of the request of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee has asked that when the Senate convenes to-morrow it proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. WATSON. At the present time I am constrained to object. I may not do so to-morrow.

Mr. BORAH. I yield now to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE AT BALTIMORE

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I renew my request for unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill which I reported from the Committee on Finance a few minutes ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill which he reported a few moments ago.

Mr. BRUCE. I withdraw my objection. The Senator has explained the bill to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7918) to diminish the number of appraisers at the port of Baltimore, and for other purposes.

Mr. MOSES. What is the measure?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the bill.

The reading clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be at the port of Baltimore one appraiser of merchandise instead of two as now provided, and the said appraiser at Baltimore shall receive a salary of \$4,500 per annum, payable out of the appropriation for expenses of collecting the revenue from customs.

Such parts of the act of August 24, 1912 (ch. 355, sec. 1, 37 Stat. 434), and the reorganization of the customs service made by the President thereunder as are inconsistent with the provisions of this act and all other laws and parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. In explanation of the bill, I will state that under the present law there are two appraisers authorized for Baltimore. One of those positions is now vacant and the Treasury Department wants to abolish it. At present the authorized salary is \$3,000 for each appraiser, but under the reclassification bill all three assistants receive more than the appraisers themselves receive. What the Treasury wants to do

is to consolidate the two positions into one and pay \$4,500, which will result in a saving of \$1,500 to the Government.

Mr. KING. What would be the average salary paid to the appraisers in ports where the work is substantially of the same character as the work in the port of Baltimore?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Around four or five thousand dollars.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was there a unanimous report from the committee on the bill?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The report of the committee on the bill was unanimous.

Mr. KING. It seems that this individual has been working for \$3,000, and now it is proposed to give him \$4,500.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. We save \$1,500 by making him do two men's work.

Mr. KING. By abolishing a useless office. It does not indicate very much economy.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETIREMENT OF CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. STANFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. STANFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that at 2 o'clock on Thursday, February 5, Senate bill 3011, to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof, be made the unfinished business.

Mr. SWANSON. I would not object to that, provided it did not interfere with the bill which has been made the unfinished business—the good roads bill. If that bill shall be disposed of by the time the Senator has fixed, I will have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SMOOT. We can not make a bill the unfinished business for some future day.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator can have it made a special order.

Mr. SMOOT. I have told the Senator from Oregon that just as soon as we can agree upon some amendments to the bill there will be no objection to taking it up. But there is no use trying to get it up to-night.

Mr. STANFIELD. I do not ask that the bill be taken up now.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BORAH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 31, 1925, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30 (legislative day of January 26), 1925

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY

Moses Gray Zalinski to be assistant to the Quartermaster General for a period of four years, with rank of brigadier general.

POSTMASTERS

KENTUCKY

George P. Ginn, Ashland.
Lloyd F. Williams, Bagdad.
Walker Jameson, Beattyville.
William T. Isaacs, Benham.
Dewitt O. Burke, Bradfordsville.
Robert H. Middleton, Buffalo.
Henry T. Short, Calhoun.
Vera Baird, Crab Orchard.
Virgil A. Matthews, Fordsville.
Egbert V. Taylor, Greensburg.
Eugene F. Stuart, Hardyville.
Allen D. Thomson, Kuttawa.
Mack R. Huston, Lakeland.
William Rice, Manchester.
York Hatfield, McVeigh.
Allen E. Bell, Moreland.
Wallace D. Jones, Mortons Gap.
John P. Graham, New Haven.
John H. Meyer, Newport.
Garrett H. Lawrence, Poor Fork.

Cameron F. Dunbar, Russell Springs.
Stace W. Poole, Seabee.
Mabelle Sharp, Sharpsburg.
Squire P. Willis, Stamping Ground.
Samuel H. McMurray, Stearns.
Rex A. O'Flynn, Utica.
Mack M. Noel, Veterans' Hospital.

NEW MEXICO

Cristobal J. Quintana, Taos.

NEW YORK

Celia D. White, Fishkill.
William C. Meade, Hall.
Rosella M. Palmeter, Purling.

TEXAS

Charles P. J. Ledwidge, Beaumont.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, January 30, 1925

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, again we are waiting for the presence of Thy Spirit. The impulse that we have to offer Thee our homage is inspired by our Creator's voice within. Always may we covet and seek the best things—treasure them up, love them, and cheerfully follow their precepts. Toward the day's work may we set ourselves with happy hearts and new desires. In every relationship which we bear to our country and to society help us to be beneficent servants and wise men. With us, O Lord, things are so often partial and uncertain. Do Thou forgive our delays and omissions. Increase our faith in Thee as our God and whatever betides may we not fail. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct the Record. On page 2727, line 10, first column, after the words "should be" insert "held out."

The SPEAKER. Without objection the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the gentleman from Ohio shall have concluded, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio that he may address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, upon what subject?

Mr. JONES. On the Agricultural Commission report.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. It is clear there is no quorum present.

Mr. SNELL. I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 42]

Barkley	Curry	Hull, Tenn.	Michaelson
Bell	Dallinger	Johnson, W. Va.	Miller, Ill.
Boylan	Dickstein	Johnson, S. Dak.	Mills
Brand, Ohio	Dominick	Kent	Montague
Briggs	Doughton	Kiess	Moore, Ill.
Britten	Drewry	Kindred	Morin
Buckley	Eagan	Langley	Nelson, Wis.
Burdick	Edmonds	Larson, Minn.	Newton, Mo.
Carew	Evans, Iowa	Lee, Calif.	Newton, Minn.
Casey	Freeman	Lee, Ga.	Nolan
Celler	Fulmer	Lindsay	O'Brien
Clark, Fla.	Goldsborough	Logan	O'Connell, N. Y.
Clarke, N. Y.	Graham	McFadden	O'Connell, R. I.
Connolly, Pa.	Griffin	McKenzie	O'Connor, La.
Cooper, Ohio	Hall	McNulty	O'Connor, N. Y.
Croft	Haugen	MacLafferty	O'Sullivan
Cummings	Hawley	Mead	Oliver, N. Y.